

830.6
M74

Monatshefte

FÜR DEUTSCHEN UNTERRICHT,
DEUTSCHE SPRACHE UND LITERATUR

Volume XLIX

January, 1957

Number 1

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL'S ESSAY "ON GOETHE'S MEISTER"

RAYMOND IMMERWAHR

Washington University

"With all due reservations Friedrich Schlegel seems . . . one of the greatest critics of history," and "he never wrote better and more appreciative criticism than the essay on *Wilhelm Meister*." These considered judgments of Professor René Wellek¹ suggest that the review of the *Lehrjahre* first published in the *Athenäum* in 1798² merits detailed analysis as an application of those critical principles which were to become in large measure the foundation of German romantic theory. Recently, Professor Victor Lange has included a few pages of discriminating comment on the essay in a survey of Schlegel's criticism,³ and Melitta Gerhard has demonstrated how Schlegel fell short of a full appreciation of Goethe's objectives.⁴ But heretofore there have been only two investigations devoted primarily to this essay as an enunciation of Schlegel's critical thought: one by Heinrich Prodnigg in 1891⁵ and the other by Konstantin Galaboff in 1917.⁶ The limited scope and rarity of the first of these and the narrow perspective of the second justify a new attempt to see how the principles foremost in Friedrich Schlegel's thought during its most fruitful period are applied to Goethe's great novel.

¹ *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, II (New Haven, 1955), pp. 32, 35.

² References to the essay will be based on the text in: Friedrich Schlegel, *Seine prosaischen Jugendschriften*, ed. J. Minor (Wien, 1882), II, 165-182. This edition will be cited below as Minor. Where quotations of the essay and other parts of the Minor edition are presented in the original German, the orthography will be modernized. The text of the essay may also be found in *Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik*, ed. Andreas Müller, Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Romantik, III (Leipzig, 1931), 144-162.

³ In his article "Friedrich Schlegel's Literary Criticism," *Comparative Literature*, VII (1955), pp. 296 ff.

⁴ "Goethes 'Geprägte Form' im romantischen Spiegel," in *On Romanticism and the Art of Translation, Studies in Honor of E. H. Zeydel*, ed. G. F. Merkel (Princeton, 1956), pp. 29-46.

⁵ *Goethes Wilhelm Meister und die aesthetische Doctrin der älteren Romantik*, XI. Jahresbericht der steiermarkischen Landesoberrealschule, Graz. Access to Prodnigg was by microfilm, which the library of Washington University procured from the University of Graz. In quotations Prodnigg's orthography will be normalized.

⁶ *Die Stellung Friedrich Schlegels und der anderen deutschen Romantiker zu Goethes "Wilhelm Meister" im Lichte des Ur-Meister* (Diss., Kiel).

Any such fresh evaluation, however, must first call attention to the maturity and sensitivity with which Prodnigg approaches those aspects of the essay which he takes into consideration. He begins by constructing a theory of the novel from the *Fragmente* published in the *Lyceum* and the *Athenäum*.⁷ The form of the novel is "liberal," that is all-embracing, elastic, and variable (*Lyc.* 26; *Ath.* 252). Its tendency is didactic, affording lessons in practical wisdom or the art of living, but the didacticism must be inseparably woven into the artistic fabric of the entire work (*Ath.* 111). The hero may predominate, but every character must be both an end in himself and a means for the work as a whole (*Ath.* 118). As the broadest of all literary forms, the novel is the one best suited to express the entire mental life of the author (*Lyc.* 78).

Prodnigg then argues that this theory of the novel could only derive from *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (Prodnigg, 6 ff.) and demonstrates that Goethe's novel in turn really fits Schlegel's prescription for an artistically integrated didacticism: "Nirgends unterbricht das Lehrhaftes als etwas äußerlich Fremdes den Fluß der Darstellung, es tritt stets als lebendiges Glied derselben auf . . . Wir haben stets das Gefühl, die betreffende Person könne nach ihrem Charakter wirklich das sagen, was ihr in den Mund gelegt wird, wir hören nicht bloß den Dichter, der sie als Sprachrohr benützt." (Prodnigg, 14 f.)

Prodnigg sees that the critical method of the essay is an effort to recapture the spirit of the work and to trace its "inner development" as a poetic and artistic whole: "Mit unendlicher Feinheit weist Schlegel nach, wie der Dichter zum Behufe einer bestimmten poetischen Wirkung die Teile gruppirt. . . . Die einzelnen Massen des Werkes müßten andernteils wieder gewissermaßen als dichterische Individuen aufgefaßt werden . . . Der gleichmäßige Fortschritt wird dadurch erreicht, daß jedes Buch die Keime der künftigen enthält und den Ertrag des vorigen verarbeitet." Prodnigg even applies this method on his own part to supplement for most of the remaining books of the novel Schlegel's example of the climactic beginning and ending which frame Book III and link it to the preceding and following books (Prodnigg, 17).

Prodnigg thinks that *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* embodies Schlegel's program, not merely for the novel, but for all literature. Schlegel himself declared: "Whoever would adequately describe Goethe's *Meister* would in so doing really say what the time demands in poetry" (*Lyc.* 120); his own observations upon *Wilhelm Meister* parallel point by point the demands he elsewhere makes as a doctrinaire theoretician. To be sure, there is a marked difference in tone: "Der Aufsatz will eben als Kunstwerk gelten und kokettiert auch mit einer gewissen Milde in der Form, die *Fragmente* dagegen sind der Tummelplatz der Unge-

⁷The *Fragmente* will hereafter be cited as *Lyc.*, *Ath.*, and *Ideen* respectively, with the serial numbers given them by Minor.

zwungenheit" (Prodnigg, 19). Schlegel's association of *Wilhelm Meister* with Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* and the French Revolution as "the greatest tendencies of the age" (Ath. 216) Prodnigg takes as evidence of a plan to erect upon the foundation of Goethe's novel a program for a new kind of literature (Prodnigg, 22), the program outlined in the famous 116th *Athenäum-Fragment*. Prodnigg concludes his study by relating the latter sentence by sentence to the principles enunciated in the essay on *Meister* (Prodnigg, 23-31). Prodnigg shares with Haym⁸ the mistaken inference that Schlegel's concept of the romantic actually was derived from Goethe's novel. Prodnigg apparently considers the "Brief über den Roman," which emphasizes late Medieval and Renaissance literature as the source of the romantic, to be a later reinterpretation.⁹ However, Lovejoy has since shown that Schlegel's essential conception of the romantic antedates the publication of *Wilhelm Meister*. Conclusive evidence that the association of *romantisch* with *Roman* to be found in the "Brief über den Roman" also antedates the essay on *Meister* and is not inspired by Goethe is to be found in a notebook dated 1797, the first in a series entitled *Fragmente zur Litteratur und Poesie*, now in the *Westdeutsche Bibliothek* in Marburg. Professor Hans Eichner has prepared an edition of the series as well as an article interpreting their use of *Roman* and *romantisch*, both currently in press.¹⁰ Heretofore only a few excerpts had been published by Josef Körner.¹¹

A little might be said at this point of the light shed by the notebook of 1797 upon the relation of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* to Schlegel's critical thought. The notebook actually contains some fairly sharp criticism of Goethe's novel;¹² but it is much more preoccupied with the classification of famous Medieval and Renaissance authors: Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto, Tasso, Pulci, Marino, Guarini, Cervantes, and Shakespeare, according to such criteria as the nature of their portrayal (*Mimik*), criticism, philosophy, irony, and above all their sentimentality and fantasy. There gradually emerges the concept of an ideal *Roman*, which would synthesize the desired qualities to be found in each of these authors, intermingling also elements of ancient and modern philoso-

⁸ *Die romantische Schule* (Berlin, 1870), pp. 250 ff.

⁹ Prodnigg, 25; Minor, 11, 371 ff.

¹⁰ See Arthur O. Lovejoy, "The Meaning of 'Romantic' in Early German Romanticism," in his *Essays in the History of Ideas* (Baltimore, 1948), pp. 190-206, and Professor Eichner's article, scheduled for publication in *PMLA*, LXXI (1956), December issue, which contains an important correction to Lovejoy's argument. Cf. also Wellek, op. cit., II. 12 ff.

¹¹ "Neues vom Dichter der 'Lucinde,'" *Preußische Jahrbücher*, CLXXXIII (1921), and CLXXXIV (1922); also his *Romantiker und Klassiker* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 99 ff.

¹² *Fragmente zur Litteratur und Poesie*, I (1797), 9, 40, and Körner, *Preußische Jahrbücher*, CLXXXIII, 312 f. Microfilm of a number of Schlegel's notebooks has been procured by the library of Washington University with the kind assistance of Professor Eichner. It should be pointed out that not all the comment on *Meister* in the 1797 notebook is adverse. It is cited on p. 40 as an example of "poetry without meter."

phical prose, spontaneous folk poetry (*Naturpoesie*), and so forth, into an "infinitely" progressive, all-embracing literary category.¹³ Literature as a whole at any period, as well as any given category or single work, is *romantisch* to the extent that it approaches the spirit of this ideal *Roman*. The notebook of 1797 confirms the evidence of the later "Brief über den Roman" that the historical sources of Schlegel's ideal are not to be found in the novel, or in any single novel, of the eighteenth century, but in the narrative, lyric, allegorical, and dramatic romances of the late Middle Ages and of the Renaissance, preëminently in the *Divine Comedy*, in the dramas of Shakespeare, and in *Don Quixote*.¹⁴ It was only after this ideal had shaped itself in Schlegel's mind, that he applied it to Goethe's novel.¹⁵ But this fact does not detract either from the value of the essay on *Meister* as an elucidation of Schlegel's concept of the novel or from that of Prodnigg's pioneering investigation.

The study of Galaboff, on the other hand, is a crude attempt to explain — or explain away — Schlegel's ideas by the relation of the finished version of the *Lehrjahre* to *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*. Galaboff mechanically sorts out those elements and qualities of the *Sendung* which are preserved in the *Lehrjahre* from those added to fit Goethe's later, post-Italian conception of the novel. Ignoring the fact that Schlegel himself was the first critic to point to the dual conception of the *Lehrjahre* (in his "Versuch über den verschiedenen Stil in Goethes früheren und späteren Werken" [Minor, II, 381], written only a few months after the essay on *Meister*), Galaboff argues that everything about the *Lehrjahre* which especially appealed to Schlegel had either originated in the *Sendung* or was the chance result of Goethe's failure to fuse the two conceptions of the novel. Grossly oversimplifying the differences between the two works, Galaboff maintains that the earlier one and its remnants in the second manifest a humorous, ironic, or neutral attitude of the author to his characters, whereas the new portions of the *Lehrjahre* present the characters in a satiric, negative, or partisan light. Galaboff does not attempt to explain either Goethe's careful selection and deliberate rearrangement of characteristic elements of the *Sendung* in the first five books of the *Lehrjahre* or Schlegel's particularly warm praise of the entirely new seventh and eighth books. Unlike Prodnigg, however, Galaboff recognizes to some extent the importance of the essay as an application of the concept of irony (Galaboff, 45 ff.).

¹³ *Zur Litteratur und Poesie*, I (1797), 2, margin of 7, 10 f., 16, 21, 35, 38 ff., 47 ff., 52 ff.

¹⁴ See Professor Eichner's article mentioned above and in note 10.

¹⁵ Only a few months later he was to express a decided preference for Tieck's *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen*. See *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, ed. O. F. Walzel (Berlin, 1890), p. 414. Cf. also Josef Körner, *Romantiker und Klassiker*, p. 103, for an unfavorable comparison of *Meister* with Cervantes in notes from the year 1800. However, *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* is again warmly praised in a review of Goethe's works published in 1808 (*Friedrich Schlegel's Sämtliche Werke* [Wien, 1825], X, 179 ff.).

The principle emphasized by Prodnigg that each segment and character of the literary creation is both an end in itself and a means to the larger whole, that the work is an entity growing according to its own inward principles and manifesting a single spirit, our contemporary criticism calls the organic view of literature.¹⁶ Although the organic view did not originate with Friedrich Schlegel,¹⁷ it would be hard to find a more brilliant and complete application than this essay. "The innate impulse of the thoroughly organized and organizing work to form itself into a whole is manifested both in its larger and its smaller segments," he declares. Yet "even the most subtle feature of incidental portrayal seems to exist for itself and to take delight in its own independent existence" (Minor II, 170 f.).

The heart of this literary organism is its titular theme. It is an apprenticeship in drama, poetry, and the fine arts; but, in the last analysis, it is an "apprenticeship in which nothing is learned but existing, but living according to one's special principles or one's inalterable nature." It embraces "not only what we call theater or poetry, but the great drama of humanity itself and the art of all arts, the art of living" (Minor, II, 178, 180). In his next essay on Goethe, Schlegel was to point to the great problem Goethe faced in unifying the novel's didactic theme, leaving open the question whether it had been fully solved: "The first [idea] was merely the novel of an artist, but now the work, surprised by the tendency of its category, suddenly became much greater than its original intention. The education in the art of life was added and became the genius of the whole."¹⁸

The theme of the work is in any case a schooling in life spreading outward from a germinating point in the theater. Schlegel traces the development and variation of this theme through the individual parts of the novel: In Books I and II, Wilhelm is introduced to the fundamentals of literature, the fine arts, and the art of living (Minor, II, 170). In Books III and IV he learns through errors, costly experience, and a "higher degree of temptation," as he strives to perfect himself in the arts of the theater; in III the theater and an aristocratic audience present themselves to him largely in a comical and ironic light, whereas in IV he

¹⁶ Cf. Morse Peckham, "Toward a Theory of Romanticism," *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 5-23, and the immediately adjacent article by James Benziger, "Organic Unity: Leibniz to Coleridge," *ibid.*, pp. 24-48.

¹⁷ Benziger mentions Leibniz, Plotinus, Karl Philipp Moritz, Herder, and Goethe. He is concerned with the transmission of the concept to Coleridge by A. W. Schlegel, who (like his brother Friedrich) drew upon these sources. Wellek cites examples from Aristotle, Marmontel, Young, and others in his *History of Modern Criticism*, I, 18, 26, 65, 110, 117 f.

¹⁸ "On the Different Styles in Goethe's Early and Late Works," Minor, II, 381. The review of 1808 points out weaknesses in the portions of Book V leading from Serlo's theater to the milieu of Lothario, precisely the part of the novel taking up the action where it was left at the end of the *Sendung*, implying that Goethe did not quite succeed in uniting the two conceptions which Schlegel discovered in the essay "On the Different Styles." See *Sämtliche Werke*, X, 182.

comes into contact with accomplished actors conscious of the principles of their art (*Minor*, II, 174 ff., quotation from p. 174). Book V, with its discussion and production of *Hamlet*, is a literary portrayal of the literary principles operative upon the stage. In Book VI the stage of life is turned inward through the introspective self-education of the Beautiful Soul, only to open outward again in VII and VIII upon "the great drama of humanity itself" (*Minor*, II, 177 ff., quotation from p. 180). The transition from each book or pair of books (originally constituting a volume) to the next is exemplified with an organic metaphor: "In the second volume [Books III and IV] as well, Jarno and the appearance of the Amazon, like the Stranger and Mignon in the first volume, entice our expectation and our interest on into an obscure distance and point toward a level of culture as yet not discernible. Here too, each book opens upon a new scene and a new world. Here too, the old figures return rejuvenated. Here too, each book contains the germs of the ensuing one and with vital energy digests the pure harvest of the foregoing book into its own peculiar being." (*Minor*, II, 173)

Such specifically organic metaphors and similes proliferate throughout the essay: "Why should one not inhale the fragrance of a flower and then nevertheless contemplate the infinite venous system of a single leaf and be able to lose oneself in this contemplation?" (*Minor*, II, 169). The work is a "divine growth" not to be appraised academically (*Minor*, II, 172). It begins "the way the formation of an aspiring mind silently unfolds and the evolving world slowly grows out from within." Nor is the organic imagery exclusively vegetable: The boy Wilhelm drinks in plays as a new-born infant sucks nourishment from its caressing mother's breast (*Minor*, II, 165 f.). The novel is described dynamically as in animate motion, "neither measured nor blustering . . . , but softly and gently, like the free strolling of one divided between melancholy and expectancy" (*Minor*, II, 168). Its close is "at first hurrying, then unexpectedly hesitant" (*Minor*, II, 181). But Schlegel sees the work as even more than an animate organism, as a personality and a spiritual entity. It can therefore begin "without presumption" (*Minor*, II, 165). The "spirit" of the whole "manifests itself" in the characters (*Minor*, II, 168). Everywhere one feels its "personality and living individuality," for "if any book has a genius, it is this one" (*Minor*, II, 172).

This living personality in turn is part of a living world, a microcosm within a macrocosm. Indeed, the very didacticism of the novel is but one aspect of Schlegel's ideal of a universal work, embracing all categories of poetry and the realms of ethics and philosophy as well, an ideal which he repeatedly attempted to formulate in his early notes and in the *Fragmente* published in the *Lyceum* and the *Athenäum*. The *Roman*, the novel or romance, unites every aspect of life, society, philosophy, poetry, and art. Goethe selected the theatrical world as the milieu and background of his novel, "because precisely this art is not merely the most

manifold, but also the most social of all arts, and because here especially poetry and life, the age and the world, make contact" (Minor, II, 170 f.). Schlegel envisages this novel as a galaxy of worlds within a world. The characters who educate Wilhelm arouse in him a "presentiment of the whole world." In Book II we look behind the wings of theatrical enchantment into the "comic world in the background" (Minor, II, 168 f.). In Books VII and VIII, Nathalie, Therese, and the Uncle each creates his own world around him (Minor, II, 180). The understanding reader must indeed have a "sense for the universe" (Minor, II, 169), for to judge the novel by an arbitrary conception of some literary category would be "as when a child tries to grasp the moon and the stars in its hand and stuff them into his little box."

For Schlegel, this universality also projects itself into the dimension of artistic techniques and media; he describes the development of the novel and its impression upon the reader in synesthetic terms borrowed from nearly every art. Goethe's language is not merely "prose and yet also poetry" (Minor II, 171); it must also be described in terms of music, painting, and architecture. Book I, which has opened "noiselessly" (Minor, II, 165), closes on a harsh discord: its "end is like a spiritual music in which the greatest variety of voices alternate quickly and violently, so many inviting tones (*Anklänge*) from the new world whose marvels are to unfold before us." The second book begins with a musical recapitulation of the first; its "finale" is an even more beautiful "harmony of dissonances," in which "the contending voices sound shrilly alongside each other" (Minor, II, 167 ff., quotations from 167, 169). But metaphors of painting are no less abundant: "The least feature is meaningful, every stroke a delicate hint, and everything is elevated by bright and vivid contrasts But the lively paintings cling to the mind" (Minor, II, 165). Book I is a series of "picturesque contrasts, in each of which Wilhelm's character is shown from another noteworthy side, in a new and brighter light; the smaller, clearly separated masses and chapters constitute . . . each for itself a picturesque whole" (Minor, II, 167 f.). The characters in Book III "are pressed on (*hingedruckt*) with such a light hand and such a delicate brush as one might imagine of the most graceful caricatures in the noblest painting" (Minor, II, 175). Anticipating the Temple of Art of Nathalie's great-uncle, Schlegel combines metaphors of painting and of architecture to characterize Book VI: "The Uncle rests in the background of this painting like a great monument of the art of living, in the grand old style, with noble, simple proportions, of the purest solid marble" (Minor, II, 179). Schlegel again symbolizes architecturally the characters of Book VIII: Lothario is a dome; the Uncle and the Abbé, its pilasters (Minor, II, 182).

Universality for Friedrich Schlegel and for romanticism generally most often means comprehensiveness, multiplicity, and heterogeneity; it is a horizontal universality of scope, embracing a vast range of con-

tents, forms, styles, and artistic media. However, Schlegel also recognizes in *Wilhelm Meister* a vertical universality of relevance, the significance of the particular trait or individual character as an expression of total human experience. Schlegel finds Goethe's portrayal such as to reveal "what is most limited at once as a peculiar, independent being in itself and as just another side, a new variant of the universal human nature, remaining one amidst all transformations, a small part of the infinite world" (Minor, II, 166). In this sense, Nathalie and Therese are seen respectively as prototypes of the ethical and of the domestic qualities in womanhood, whereas Mariane represents "the deserted, broken woman as such" (Minor, II, 180 f.).

As we are reminded by Professor Wellek, "Friedrich Schlegel introduced the term irony into modern literary discussion" (*History of Modern Criticism*, II, 16). Literary scholarship has, for the most part, focused upon the *Fragmente* and failed to emphasize sufficiently the importance of Schlegel's critical essays for this new concept.¹⁹ Prodnigg barely alludes to irony, believing that its roots belong to an area "essentially different" from the study of Goethe's novel (Prodnigg, 31). Galaboff devotes some attention to this aspect of the essay, but his arbitrary method reduces it to two elements: The first, the sublime detachment (*Erhabenheit*) of the author from his work, is to be found "nicht in den eigentlichen Lehrjahren, sondern nur in der darin enthaltenen 'Sendung'"; the second, the "harmony of dissonances," is merely the unintentional result of the dichotomy in the conception of the novel.²⁰ Galaboff's theory can hardly account for the fact that Schlegel finds no less ironic detachment and even more sublimity in Books VII and VIII, which belong entirely to the "eigentlichen Lehrjahren," than in Book III, which is closest of all to the *Theatralische Sendung*. The dismissal of the "harmony of dissonances" as an unconscious, chance juxtaposition of literary atoms would have to mean not merely that Goethe failed to harmonize his two conceptions of the novel but that he was not even mindful of the conflict. Apart from this injustice to Goethe's conscious artistry, Galaboff is unable to cope with the breadth, complexity, and subtlety of Schlegel's concept.

Perhaps the best approach to the application of irony in the essay is an examination of the two passages in which Schlegel explicitly attributes irony to Goethe:

- (1) The author himself seems to take the characters and incidents so lightly and whimsically, almost never to mention the hero without irony, and to smile down upon his masterpiece from the height

¹⁹ A notable exception is Heinrich Henel's "Friedrich Schlegel und die Grundlagen der modernen literarischen Kritik," *GR*, XX (1945), 88 ff. Cf. also my "Subjectivity or Objectivity of Friedrich Schlegel's Poetic Irony," *GR*, XXVI (1951), 173-191.

²⁰ Galaboff, pp. 52 ff., quotation from p. 52. For the phrase "Harmonie von Dissonanzen" in the essay, see Minor, II, 169, line 22.

of his spirit; but this must not deceive one into thinking that he is not most solemnly in earnest.

(2) The irony which hovers over the whole work but becomes especially audible here [in Book III] has to be made wholly perceptible to those who have a sense for it by someone who knows how to read aloud and completely understands [this irony]. This semblance — smiling at itself — of dignity and significance in the periods; these seeming slips and tautologies, which fulfil the conditions so perfectly that they seem to merge again with the conditioned work and to say — or seem to mean — everything or nothing, as opportunity allows; this highly prosaic quality in the midst of the poetic mood of the subject portrayed or ridiculed, the deliberate touch of poetic pedantry on very prosaic occasions — these often rest upon a single word, even an accent. (Minor, II, 171, 175)

The irony mentioned in these passages is a subtle, hidden ambiguity in the author's relation to the characters, episodes, form, and style of his work. He views his creation and his medium ironically because he knows they reflect the paradox and incongruity inherent in the universe as man must experience it and inherent also in the literary communication of experience. For "irony is the form of the paradoxical" (*Lyc.* 48); "irony is a clear consciousness of eternal mobility, of the infinitely full chaos" (*Ideen*, number 69).

Occasionally the incongruities in the novel which reflect this universal paradox are ludicrously obvious, as in the instances of the chill reception of the actors arriving at the Count's castle in Book III (Minor, II, 174 f.), the pregnancy of so undomestic a character as Philine, and the supposedly dying Felix's request for bread and butter (Minor, II, 181). Elsewhere both comic and tragic paradoxes are hidden beneath the surface; the author only subtly reminds us of them or leaves their discovery to the discerning reader. Such are the unfavorable light cast upon Wilhelm's idealistic theatrical aspirations by his encounter with the cynical and mercenary actor Melina in Book I (Minor, II, 166 f.); the "parallel" course which Wilhelm's intentions and actions take "without ever disturbing or touching each other"; the vulgarity of the nobility in Book III (Minor, II, 174 f., quotation from 174); the portrayal of "religion as a congenital dilettantism" in Book VI (Minor, II, 179). In Book VII the procuress Barbara speaks with the power and majesty of ancient tragedy; the one fault of Lothario is "the hereditary fault of all greatness, the capacity to destroy" (Minor, II, 181 f., quotation from 182).

Not without plausibility, Schlegel suggests that there is deliberate irony in Goethe's unraveling of the threads of his plot at the novel's close: "How disappointed the readers of this novel can feel at its end, when nothing comes of all these educational arrangements but a modest charm, when nothing is concealed behind all these marvellous coincidences, prophetic hints, and mysterious apparitions but the most sub-

lime poetry." The capricious secret society of pure intellect, around which everything revolves, makes fun of Wilhelm and of itself and finally even becomes "upright, useful and economical" (*noch rechtlich und nützlich und ökonomisch*). But, "since the portrayal takes and presents everything else on a grand scale, why should it not also avail itself generously of traditional poetic license?" (Minor, II, 181). Granted that Goethe was more serious about the objectives of the secret Lodge than Schlegel cares to admit, the use of this eighteenth-century novellistic cliché and its accompanying paraphernalia²¹ in the structural framework of the plot may well have been a conscious poetic license, an ironic acceptance of and indulgence in limitations intrinsic to the novel. Something of this sort seems implied when Jarno tells Wilhelm: "All the things you have seen in the Tower are really only relics of a youthful undertaking, which most of the initiates took seriously to begin with and at which they now all occasionally smile." (Book VII, Ch. V)

A phrase associated with irony in some of Schlegel's paradoxical aphorisms is the "alternation of self-creation and self-annihilation" (*Ath.* 51; cf. also *Lyc.* 37), significantly qualified in the 305th *Athenäum-Fragment* as "a semblance of self-annihilation." In the notebook of 1797 Schlegel distinguishes classical, natural, and sentimental poetry, all of which annihilate their own creation, from progressive poetry, which likewise destroys, but then creates itself anew.²² I have indicated in an earlier article that the creation and annihilation in question need not apply to representative illusion, as some critics have inferred (*Germanic Review*, XXVI, 178 ff., 189 f.). In *Lyc.* 37 Schlegel explicitly states that he means the reciprocal activity of spontaneous inspiration and conscious, self-restraining circumspection in giving birth and form to the work of art. The examples of "creation and destruction" cited in the essay on Goethe's *Meister* show how Schlegel saw the operation of this dialectical process in the "progressive" work of art: Wilhelm's yearning for an eternal union with Mariane "is heightened . . . to the utmost until the ardor is suddenly extinguished . . . and the whole beautiful ideal world of the enamored youth is annihilated at one stroke." Book II begins with a recapitulation of this theme: "the slow but complete annihilation of the poetry of Wilhelm's childhood dreams and of his first love." "Then the spirit, which has sunk with Wilhelm to these depths . . . , is revived anew and powerfully awakened . . . by the passionate recollection of Mariane and by the youth's enthusiastic praise of poetry, confirming by its beauty the reality of his original dream . . ." (Minor, II, 167 f.). The comic quality of Book III results from the new disenchantment which inevitably follows upon Wilhelm's

²¹ See Marianne Thalmann, *Der Trivialroman des 18. Jahrhunderts und der romantische Roman*, Germanische Studien, Heft XXIV (Berlin, 1923), especially pp. 71-104 and 161 ff.

²² Zur Litteratur und Poesie, I, 12, 16. Again and again the notes praise Goethe as a "progressive" literary personality.

theatrical aspirations and his expectations from the nobility (Minor, II, 174 f.).

Just as the novel progresses dialectically from aspiration through disenchantment and renewed, heightened aspiration, so it must also be read dialectically to be appreciated as a work of poetic art: "It is fine and essential to give oneself up wholly to the impression of a poem, to let the artist make of us what he will . . . But it is no less essential to be able to abstract from all detail, to hover over the universal and to grasp it . . . We must elevate ourselves above our own love and be able to destroy in thought what we revere; otherwise, whatever capacities we may have, we lack the sense for the universe." The reader who is a "complete human being" will want to "feel and think" at the same time, to know "how the whole is constructed," to seek after the secret objectives "which most of all make the poet an artist" (Minor, II, 169 f.).

It will be observed that this dialectical process of creation, destruction, and re-creation²³ has two closely related facets of meaning: The "progressive" literary artist creates a poetic impression for the reader and then destroys, or seems to destroy it, only to create it anew on a higher level. But Schlegel also means the reciprocal function of feeling and thinking, of creative instinct or intuition and of delimiting, analytical reason in artist and recipient alike. It is surely arbitrary to designate the formative, analytical, or critical function as an "annihilation," but this is what Schlegel consistently does from his early notebook entries in 1797 through the introductions to his edition of Lessing in 1804.²⁴

This second aspect of the polarity, the antithesis between feeling and reflection, is implied a number of times in our essay. The Stranger appears in Book I, "so that there will not be a mere striving of feeling out into an empty infinity but that the eye may be able to calculate the distance sensuously from a large perspective, to delimit the broad view in some measure . . ." (Minor, II, 167). The conclusion of Book II "overpowers us more" than that of Book I "and yet leaves us more thoughtful" (Minor, II, 169). The harmonious relation of the parts of the novel to the whole results "from their unintentional (*ab-*

²³ The dialectical method by which Schlegel analyses the creative process, the work of art itself, and the artistic experience of the recipient is, of course, part of the development of German transcendental idealism from Kant to Hegel. Schlegel's method is, in particular, influenced by Fichte and Schiller and was developed contemporaneously, and in some measure jointly, with that of Schelling. On the importance of the dialectical concept in romantic criticism, see Wellek, op. cit., II, 2 f.

²⁴ For example, in an introduction to Lessing's *Erziehung des Menschen*, entitled "Vom Charakter der Protestant," Schlegel identifies the "destroying" or critical function in religion with Protestantism. This function, if fulfilled ideally as in Lessing's case, has ultimate positive value. *Lessings Geist aus seinen Schriften, oder dessen Gedanken und Meinungen zusammengestellt und erläutert von Friedrich Schlegel*, III (Leipzig, 1810 [unchanged reprint of 1804 ed.]), 1-22.

sichtslose) uniformity and original unity," but also from the poet's "deliberate (*absichtsvolle*) endeavor" to round them into a complete whole (Minor, II, 173). *Hamlet* is selected for the maturing of Wilhelm's understanding of literature because it is the play that can best lead him from a sense for Shakespeare's infinitude and naturalness to an appreciation of "his deep artifice and design" (Minor, II, 176 f.).

The same dialectical relation of spontaneous impulse and critical consciousness is applied by Schlegel to the reader's interest, his personal concern for, or involvement in the characters and the plot of the novel. Schlegel's earlier, classical phase of criticism had distinguished modern literature, to its disadvantage, from the objectively perceived beauty of classical poetry, precisely because modern literature was *interessant*, compelling the reader's involvement. A passage in Schlegel's last major work of this period, the essay *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie*, locates Goethe "midway between the interesting and the beautiful" (Minor, I, 115). After Schlegel transferred his preference from ancient to romantic literature, he put somewhat less stress on *das Interessante* as one of its distinguishing characteristics. However, the essay on *Meister* alternates between a discussion of the work itself and of "our" experience of the work as readers. Schlegel seems to feel that the involvement of the reader is more intense in the first two and in the last three books of the novel, whereas the central portions call for more critical, detached observation. Accordingly, the first and last portions of his essay are more concerned with the experience of the reader, the central portion with the novel as a work of art subject to critical scrutiny. At the beginning of the novel the reader feels his spirit "lightly touched" or "gently . . . stimulated." He follows Wilhelm's deeply felt recollections of the puppet plays "with a benevolent smile"; but his "participation (*Teilnahme*) in Wilhelm's feelings and desires cannot be free of concern," and at the end of Book I his "suspense is spiced with a touch of impatience" (Minor, II, 166 f.). Schlegel again emphasizes our interest near the end of his essay, using derivatives of *inter-esse* three times in half a sentence: ". . . und wenn Wilhelm uns nur durch die Fähigkeit, sich für alles zu interessieren, interessant bleibt, so darf auch die Tante durch die Art, wie sie sich für sich selbst interessiert, Ansprüche darauf machen, ihr Gefühl mitzuteilen" (Minor, II 178). Unlike some subsequent readers, Schlegel finds his interest at its peak in Book VIII. Here Lothario becomes "the most interesting character" in the whole novel. When we learn of the fate of Mariane, she interests us as a type rather than as an individual. The end of this book reminds us again "of many of the most interesting . . . elements of the whole work." Even characters for whom we feel little emotional attachment "are of infinite interest to the intellect" (Minor, II, 181 f.).

However, between the impulsive *Teilnahme* at the beginning and the more intellectually conscious *Interesse* at the end of the essay, comes

the central portion, concerned with Books III to V, in which Schlegel calls for a detached and critical observation of the work. Here the references to the reader are less frequent, but more impersonal and normative: "Man lasse sich . . . nicht täuschen . . . Man darf es nur auf die höchsten Begriffe beziehen" (Minor, II, 171). The reader's involvement in the work is thus "destroyed" in the center of the essay to be "re-created" on a higher, more conscious level near the end. At the very end, however, the majestic tragedy of Mignon's funeral transcends any mere interest: "It seems as though all that has preceded has only been a witty, interesting game, and as though now the work were becoming earnest . . . Here the curtain of the sanctuary is opened, and we are suddenly upon a height on which everything is divine, serene, and pure" (Minor, II, 182). Schlegel has derived a structural pattern for his essay from the relation of the reader to the novel: a dialectical progression from passive emotional participation, through disciplined critical analysis, to discriminating intellectual interest, and then finally to a moment of ultimate insight. Schlegel considered the essay fragmentary; perhaps because it failed to touch upon some important elements of Book VIII, such as the history of Mignon's birth, perhaps because he left the problem of its dual conception to be discussed elsewhere. From a formal standpoint, however, it is complete, and anything added after the last sentence would have weakened its unity.

The three books of the novel which the essay treats in a detached, critical manner are those devoted to the stage and the drama. Wilhelm is introduced to Shakespeare in Book III, and the following two books are devoted to the production and critique of *Hamlet*. The consideration of the drama, and of *Hamlet* in particular, illustrates still another concept of Friedrich Schlegel closely allied to irony, that designated in his aphorisms as self-reflective poetry, or as *Poesie der Poesie*. These terms connote, not the direct discussion of the particular literary work within that work itself, but the use of creative literature as a material of creative literature, the organically integrated consideration of the nature of poetry within the poem. Where such consideration is part of a general philosophical concern for the relationship of the real and the ideal, the "poetry of poetry" becomes "transcendental" as well.²⁵ These two concepts, derived from the philosophical systems of Kant and from some aspects of Schiller's "sentimental poetry,"²⁶ are among Schlegel's most significant contributions to critical theory. As the supreme example of transcendental poetry, Schlegel cites the *Divine Comedy* (Ath. 247), and it is not difficult to see why: Dante's work relates temporal, earthly reality to the ideals, the ultimate, eternal realities, of

²⁵ See Ath. 116, 238, 247. Cf. my article cited in note 19, *GR*, XXVI (1951), 181, 184 f., and Professor Eichner's edition of Schlegel's notebooks, to be published in 1957.

²⁶ See *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtkunst*, Schiller's *Sämtliche Werke* (Säkular-Ausgabe, Stuttgart und Berlin, 1905), XII, 192 f.

ethics and theology. And, to use the terminology of *Athenäum-Fragment* 116, the *Divine Comedy* is the culmination of a series, in which each member "reflects" the preceding ones and "raises them to a higher power" (*potenzieren*). The *Aeneid* is a "higher power" of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, Statius' *Thebaid* a higher power of Homer, Virgil, and other classical sources. Dante, reflecting upon and giving new meaning and poetic form to the materials of the *Aeneid* and the *Thebaid*, incorporating Virgil and Statius, along with some Medieval poets, into his work, raises them to a still higher "power." We find an analogous process in Shakespeare and Goethe: In the players' scene *Hamlet* itself becomes a transcendental *Poesie der Poesie*. Schlegel finds in this drama a "retarding quality" making it akin to the novel and thus eminently qualified to be raised to a still higher poetic "power" by Goethe: "The view of *Hamlet* . . . [presented in Books IV and V] is not so much criticism as it is lofty poetry. For what else can be created but a poem when a poet as such contemplates and portrays a work of poetic art? . . . Such poetic criticism is not at all concerned with saying . . . simply what the thing is and what position it does and should occupy in the world . . . On the contrary, the poet and artist will want to portray the portrayal afresh, to form over again what has already been given form. He will supplement the work, rejuvenate it, shape it anew."²⁷

In this novel, "everything revolves around theater, portrayal, art, and poetry. It was . . . the poet's intention to set up, or rather to portray in living examples and glimpses, quite a complete esthetic." Schlegel shows how Goethe uses the puppet plays, the performances of miners, acrobats, and jugglers, the comedy improvised on the river excursion, and the songs of Mignon and the Harpist to present a "living scale" of natural development and of educational philosophy (Minor, II, 170).

The direct concern of transcendental poetry is with poetic problems as such. *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* does not allude to the circumstances of its own creation, much less play upon them like the "grotesques" and "arabesques" of Sterne, Jean Paul, and Diderot.²⁸ Nevertheless, in some way Goethe too communicates to the reader his preoccupation with his own work. For this is "one of the books that evaluate themselves and save the critics all the bother; in fact, it not only evaluates; it portrays itself" (Minor, II, 172). *Hamlet* too has "a spirit of contemplation and withdrawal into itself, . . . a peculiarity common to all highly intellectual poetry" (Minor, II, 177). Schlegel does not specify the means by which this is done in either instance, but he does refer to "the subtlest hints," by which the "spirit of the poet visible through the work" is communicated to the consciousness of Goethe's

²⁷ Minor, II, 177. Cf. also Victor Lange, *Comparative Literature*, VII (1955), 297 ff.

²⁸ See the "Brief über den Roman," Minor, II, 368 f.

observant readers (Minor, II, 167). This would seem to mean the new light in which each successive level of Wilhelm's and the novel's progress is seen from the next higher level. We might count here Wilhelm's early literary interests and theatrical associations as they are made to appear by the criticism of the Stranger and of Serlo, the Uncle's comments on the Beautiful Soul, the sudden change in Wilhelm's view of the relationship between Aurelie and Lothario, Jarno's comment (cited above) on the secret society.

The inevitable question whether Schlegel considered his own review a further *Potenzierung* of Goethe's novel and thus in itself a kind of *Poesie der Poesie* cannot be answered categorically, because Schlegel acknowledged no sharp boundary between poetry and criticism. In *Lyc.* 117 he says: "Poetry can only be criticized by means of poetry," and he suggests as one means of achieving such poetic criticism "a beautiful form and a liberal tone in the spirit of ancient ironic satire" (Minor, II, 200). His essay on *Meister* obviously has pretensions of this kind, but he must have realized that it is not creative literature, *Poesie*, in the same sense as Goethe's work. At all events, the central portion of the essay is "transcendental" in another sense, as a *Kritik der Kritik*. Schlegel maintains here that the function of the critic should be to help the reader become conscious of the living individuality and genius of the work. With an organic work like Goethe's, the critical interpretation must limit itself to larger segments and not become lost in the infinitesimal, should, in particular, concentrate upon elements that seem new and unique in the novel. A mere recension of such a work would be as ludicrous and superfluous as the young man with the book who attempts to enumerate the elements of beauty in a woodland scene, only to be driven off by the ridicule of Philine (Book II, Ch. IV). Even the best criticism will give no new information to really discerning readers and will convey nothing to readers without discernment. It is the reader with a partial understanding who may derive benefit. He will be enlightened on some aspects of the work, and if he is more thoroughly confused as to others even such confusion may become productive (Minor, II, 172 ff.).

Schlegel's own critique has been censured, even by Prodnigg (18 f.) for its almost exclusive concern with the esthetic values of Goethe's novel. However, Schlegel is aware that the work can be examined from different perspectives, such as the social and ethical.

It is, in fact, simply inexhaustible, and a really balanced criticism could only take the form of conversations (Minor, II, 180), like the conversations on Hamlet within the novel itself, or perhaps like Schlegel's slightly later *Gespräch über die Poesie*. The conversations on *Hamlet* make surmises going "beyond the limits of the visible work"; but this all true criticism must do, for "every excellent work, of whatever kind

it may be, knows more than it says and intends more than it knows" (Minor, II, 177).

One of Schlegel's justifications for the critical scrutiny of Goethe's novel in the central section of the essay is the need of examining the innumerable "secret intentions" of "the genius, whose instinct has become *Willkür*" (Minor, II, 170). Linked, as we see it here, with the mutual operation of instinct and design, the concept of *Willkür* is part of the complex of ideas associated in Schlegel's thought with irony. The wide range of senses in which he uses the term *Willkür*, extending from considered option to arbitrary caprice, is typical of the exasperating elusiveness and ambiguity of his esthetic thought in general. When the 116th *Athenäum-Fragment* calls it the first law of romantic poetry, "daß die Willkür des Dichters kein Gesetz über sich leide," we are tempted to think only of examples like Tieck's *Sternbald* and Schlegel's own *Lucinde*. But Schlegel could also say: "Was unbedingte Willkür, und sonach Unvernunft oder Übervernunft scheint und scheinen soll, muß dennoch im Grunde auch wieder schlechthin notwendig und vernünftig sein" (*Lyc.* 37). It is primarily in this latter sense that one must understand Schlegel's applications of *Willkür* to Goethe: The poet is not bound by pre-existing conventions, rules, or definitions of literary categories. His motivations are complex and subtle, comprising the ironic antitheses of life and the universe, and his choice is free; but it is deliberate, meaningful, and necessary.

Schlegel admits that the elements of the novel may often enough seem connected arbitrarily, but the discriminating reader will always acknowledge and respect "das Göttliche der gebildeten Willkür" (Minor, II, 172). The very inclusion of Book VI in the novel might seem extremely *willkürlich*, but Schlegel points out some inner relationships between the characters of Wilhelm and the heroine of the "Confessions," Nathalie's aunt (Minor, II, 178 f.). *Willkür* is again conspicuous in the unraveling of the threads of the plot by means of the secret society, but it is that "of a completely cultivated spirit," the Abbé (and, implicitly, Goethe as well) (Minor, II, 181).

The pronouncement of the 116th *Athenäum-Fragment* that the *Willkür* of the poet is the first law of romantic poetry is only an extreme manifestation of a tendency that pervades the entire romantic movement, its assertion of freedom from poetic conventions, rules, and rigid "unities." What is to be liberated is always the creative imagination of the poet together with the imaginative experience which his work kindles in the reader. The imagination so liberated can create organically according to the animating principle of the individual artistic work, and it can also realize artistically the antithetical, dialectical character which the German romanticists saw throughout human life and the universe. But, above all, the imagination in both creative poet and reader is free to

expand without limit or — in the romanticists' favorite mathematical metaphor — "to infinity."

Let us observe some of the ways in which Schlegel attributes this infinitely expansive quality to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*: Wilhelm's "whole activity and being consists in striving, willing, and feeling"; his formative capacity is "boundless" (Minor, II, 168). He achieves poetic maturity through Shakespeare, the poet who preëminently "deserves to be called infinite" (Minor, II, 176). The introspective contemplation of Nathalie's aunt is multiplied, "as though to infinity" (Minor, II, 179). The most limited element in the novel seems "a small part of the infinite world" (Minor, II, 166).

The "infinite" was characteristically associated by Schlegel with those elements in literature and in life which could provide unlimited appeal to the imagination and cast a spell of awe or wonder: the sublime, the remote, the strange, and the marvellous; obscurity, mystery, magic, and enchantment — the qualities, in other words, which even before Schlegel's time were most commonly associated with the romantic. At the end of Book I we encounter the Stranger — a romantic figure adopted from contemporary popular novels (Marianne Thalmann, 94 ff., 166) — "alone and incomprehensible, like an apparition from another, nobler world," drawing our expectancy on toward an "obscure distance" and suggesting "the heights to which the work is yet to rise." Wilhelm possesses a "high enchantment" for the reader (Minor, II, 167 f., 173), and only forcibly can the latter wrest himself free of the "enchantment" cast by the poet. Goethe's prose delights in "strange similes" that lend a suggestion of something "most exalted and delicate" even to a commonplace trade" (Minor, II, 170 f.). Around the secret Lodge Goethe weaves a fabric of "miraculous coincidences" and "mysterious apparitions" with "the strangest connections" (Minor, II, 181). And he also knows how to entice our imagination back into a vague, remote age, that "most evocative past of ancient heroes, of a still innocent world of poets" (Minor, II, 168). Along with these romantic contents of experience there comes the most characteristic of romantic moods, yearning (Minor, II, 167, 178).

A great number of such romantic ingredients are concentrated within a single paragraph of the essay:

Nun folgt sein Eintritt in die Welt, . . . gelinde und leise wie das freie Lustwandeln eines, der zwischen *Schwermut* und *Erwartung* geteilt, von *schmerzlichsten Erinnerungen* zu noch *abndungsvoller* Wünschen schwankt. . . . Eine neue Welt breitet sich *lockend* vor uns aus. Alles ist hier *seltsam*, bedeutend, *wundervoll* und von *geheimem Zauber* umweht. . . . Auch in ihnen äußert sich jene frische Gegenwart, jenes *magische Schweben zwischen Vorwärts und Rückwärts*. . . . Alles was die *Erinnerung* und die *Schwermut* und die *Reue* nur *Rübrendes* hat, atmet und klagt der Alte wie aus einer *unbekannten bodenlosen Tiefe* von Gram und ergreift uns mit wilder *Webmut*.

Noch süßere Schauer und gleichsam ein schönes Grausen erregt das heilige Kind, mit dessen Erscheinung die innerste Springfeder des sonderbaren Werks plötzlich frei zu werden scheint. Dann und wann tritt Marianens Bild hervor, wie ein bedeutender Traum; plötzlich erscheint der seltsame Fremde und verschwindet schnell wie ein Blitz. (Minor, II, 168 f., my italics)

Mystery, magic, strangeness, discovery are themes that arouse the romantic imagination; remoteness in past or future time or "bottomless depths" of space and detached "hovering" are perspectives that give it added play: wonder, expectancy, recollection, presentiment, and the dream are states of consciousness in which it can operate the more freely. But along with all of these we see also the tremulous emotional quality which always accompanies romantic imagination, expressed here in terms like *Schwermut*, *Reue*, *Wehmut*, *Schauer*, *Grausen*, *Rührendes*. What is most characteristically romantic of all, "our" self-conscious imagination (that of Goethe's readers and critic), takes introspective delight in its own boundless play and is fascinated by its own moods: The recollections are "painfully sweet," the shudder "sweeter still," the horror "beautiful."

In this passage and wherever the emotional impact of the novel is most manifest, Schlegel is particularly mindful of Mignon and the Harpist, and with them he twice associates the word *romantisch*. First he mentions their "romantic songs" as a revelation of "the natural language and music of beautiful souls" (Minor, II, 170). The second time, this pair is contrasted with some characters of the last two books who can only interest the intellect: "This is not so in the case of Mignon, Sperata, and Augustino, the holy family of natural poetry, who give romantic enchantment and music to the whole and perish in the excess of their own spiritual fervor. It seems as though this anguish would rend our souls (*Gemüt*) out of joint; but this anguish has the form and the tone of a lamenting deity, and its voice pours down along the waves of melody like the devotion of majestic choirs" (Minor, II, 182).

These passages show that for Schlegel the romantic is intimately associated with emotion and, through emotion, with music. It may be argued that he uses the adjective here in the general, popular sense, commonplace in his time and in ours; that like any reader Schlegel could involuntarily call Mignon, her mother, and the Harpist romantic characters without thinking of his own theories on the nature of the romantic. But Friedrich Schlegel would not have chosen this popular term as a vehicle for his own esthetic theory had he not considered its current meanings and associations, together with its etymological origin, significant for the new theoretical connotations which he was trying to add to it. His theoretical recognition of traditional connotations of the word is enunciated in a famous sentence of the "Brief über den Roman": "In my opinion and in my language, precisely that is romantic which presents sentimental material in a fantastic form." That the term "sentimental"

is not used here in Schiller's special sense, as an esthetic antithesis of the naive, becomes clear in a passage on the next page: "What then is this sentimental? That which registers with us when feeling prevails, not sensual but spiritual feeling. The source and soul of all these stirrings is love, and the spirit of love must everywhere hover invisibly visible in romantic poetry" (Minor, II, 370f.). Sentiment is also stressed in numerous passages in the notebook of 1797, such as the following: "Sentimentalität ohne die unendliche Energie u[nd] Einsicht eines Shakesp[eare] nicht sehr interessant, mit ihr unendlich interessant" (p. 11). The symbols F/O + S/O, the combination of infinite fantasy and infinite sentiment, recur again and again in these early notes as the most commonly cited characteristic of the romantic; but the association of sentiment and boundless imagination was no less central to the connotations of the word in popular usage in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Another sentence in the context of the definition just cited from the "Brief über den Roman" makes it clear that Schlegel also stressed the historical development of the adjective "romantic" from the chivalrous romances of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: "Da suche und finde ich das Romantische, bei den ältern Modernen, bei Shakespeare, Cervantes, in der italienischen Poesie, in jenem Zeitalter der Ritter, der Liebe und der Märchen, aus welchem die Sache und das Wort selbst herstammt" (Minor, II, 372).

We can say, then, that Schlegel finds throughout Goethe's novel abundant and varied stimuli to the unlimited expansive activity of the imagination (*Phantasie*). Where this is combined with profound sentiment (carefully distinguished in the "Brief über den Roman" from commonplace pathos, tearfulness, and facile philanthropic emotions) (Minor, II, 370 f.), he uses the adjective *romantisch*. The essay on *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* does not discuss the relation of the novel as a whole to the romantic, but an answer is provided in the "Essay on the Different styles in Goethe's Early and Late Works": Goethe's novel, with its ancient spirit beneath a modern garb, "opens up a quite new, endless prospect of what appears to be the highest mission of all poetic art, the harmony of the classical and the romantic."²⁹

Before concluding, we must face the questions of the validity of the essay on *Meister* as criticism of Goethe and of its authenticity as an expression of Schlegel's view. Two serious objections can be raised against its validity: its virtually unreserved praise of the work as a masterpiece of artistic unity and its playing down of the specifically anti-romantic didactic tendencies which come into prominence in the last two books.³⁰ In defense of Schlegel's attempts to explain away all seem-

²⁹ Minor, II, 381. Considerably later, however, in his review of 1808, Schlegel conceded that the work was "ein Roman gegen das Romantische" (*Sämtliche Werke*, X, 183).

³⁰ Cf. Victor Lange, *Comparative Literature*, VII, 297

ing imperfections as deliberate irony or as the reasoned *Willkür* of an unfathomable genius beyond all criticism, it can only be pointed out that Goethe was fully conscious of the difficulty of unifying two artistic conceptions of nearly opposite tendency,³¹ and that what his novel loses in unity is compensated in breadth and depth of significance. One may ask how many successes there are in German prose fiction that can even approach Goethe's failure. But it cannot be emphasized too strongly that Schlegel's attribution of a subtle but profound and conscious irony to the style and form of Goethe's work does not stand or fall with Goethe's realization of complete artistic unity. This part of Schlegel's interpretation can rest upon its applicability to the novel as it stands, together with the available evidence of Goethe's acquiescence.³²

The objection that Schlegel glossed over Goethe's declared intentions can be raised particularly against a passage near the end of the essay: "We see . . . that this apprenticeship could educate and would be intended to educate anyone else to a competent artist or a competent man sooner than Wilhelm himself. The object was not the education of some one person or other but the portrayal of nature and education themselves in manifold examples and their concentration into simple principles" (Minor, II, 180). It must, of course, be protested that Goethe, for all his interest in the educative process *per se*, was seriously concerned with the education of Wilhelm from an idealistic, dreaming youth "into a competent man."³³ But it may be said in partial support of Schlegel that the romanticism of Mignon and the Harpist never quite lost their appeal and significance for Goethe as essential components of human experience; his efforts to negate them as simply pathological never quite succeeded. The importance of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* for world literature does not lie in the classicism purged of every romantic taint for which Goethe consciously strove as he finished the novel, but rather in that vision of a synthesis enunciated by Schlegel in his next essay on Goethe.

The possibility of questioning the authenticity of Schlegel's essay or his intellectual honesty in writing it arises from the fact that while he praised *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* in print he was privately attacking it and aspiring to challenge Goethe's claim to novellistic sovereignty with his own pretender, *Lucinde*.³⁴ It is certainly true that the tone

³¹ This may be stated both on internal evidence, the judicious treatment of material from the *Sendung* in the *Lehrjahre*, and on that of Goethe's own utterances on the problem of the novel's unity, development, and ultimate meaning. See H. G. Gräf, *Goethe über seine Dichtungen*, Erster Theil, Band II, 746, 830, 938 f., 1011.

³² Caroline Schlegel reported a very favorable reaction from Goethe to Schlegel's essay. See *Caroline, Briefe aus der Frühromantik*, ed. G. Waitz, rev. Erich Schmidt (Leipzig, 1913), I, 455. Cf. Körner, *Romantiker und Klassiker*, pp. 94 f., and Melitta Gerhard, op. cit., pp. 30 ff., 37.

³³ Or, as Melitta Gerhard says, into a personality of clearcut form developed organically but in accordance with essential norms of life (op. cit., pp. 44 f.)

³⁴ See Körner, *Romantiker und Klassiker*, pp. 97 f.

of Schlegel's utterances, and in some cases even the approval or disapproval of individual works, must be judged in relation to the audience to which he is addressing himself. However, the audience which Schlegel was most anxious to flatter was not Goethe but himself and his own literary aspirations. When *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* is deprecated in Schlegel's private notebooks and correspondence, it is done to make the mad dream of literary glory through *Lucinde* a little more plausible to himself. The fact that these same notebooks contain the highest praise of Goethe's total literary personality should clear Schlegel of any suspicion of hypocrisy, even while justifying the inference that the essay on *Meister* was not written entirely without mental reservations.

In the last analysis, there is no one kind of utterance which presents Schlegel's judgment free of any distortion. The essay we have been considering is more extravagant in its praise of Goethe's novel than Schlegel's private jottings, just as it is more restrained in its statement of literary objectives than the aphorisms published to confound and stimulate the intellects of his reading public. The problem of the "real" Schlegel is one for the psychologists. What we are concerned with is the fundamental criteria by which he appraises literary works, and those which we have found in the critique of *Wilhelm Meister* are the ones which he applies consistently in his critical utterances of the three or four years beginning with 1797. In 1798, when the essay was written, *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* came closer than any other published novel to exemplifying Friedrich Schlegel's ideals. It was an organically growing and progressive work; universal in scope, import, and artistic technique; ironically urbane, paradoxical, and dialectical; a "transcendental" consideration of literature and literary problems in a literary form; a source of unlimited stimulus to the romantic imagination. The essay itself is a considered, responsible utterance directed to the author and the most mature readers of this novel. It is the most balanced, the most complete, and the most explicit pronouncement of the intellect that made the greatest original contribution to the critical thought of Western European romanticism.



Alle Gemüter, die sie lieben, befreundet und bindet Poesie mit unauflöslichen Banden. Mögen sie sonst im eignen Leben das Verschiedenste suchen, einer gänzlich verachten, was der andere am heiligsten hält, sich verkennen, nicht vernehmen, ewig fremd bleiben, in dieser Region sind sie dennoch durch höhere Zauberkraft einig und in Frieden. Jede Muse sucht und findet die andre, und alle Ströme der Poesie fließen zusammen in das allgemeine große Meer.

Die Vernunft ist nur eine und in allen dieselbe; wie aber jeder Mensch seine eigne Natur hat und seine eigne Liebe, so trägt auch jeder seine eigne Poesie in sich. Die muß ihm bleiben und soll ihm bleiben, so gewiß er der ist, der er ist, so gewiß nur irgend etwas Ursprüngliches in ihm war; und keine Kritik kann und darf ihm sein eigenstes Wesen, seine innerste Kraft rauben, um ihn zu einem allgemeinen Bild ohne Geist und ohne Sinn zu läutern und zu reinigen, wie die Toren sich bemühen, die nicht wissen, was sie wollen. Aber lehren soll ihn die hohe Wissenschaft echter Kritik, wie er sich selbst bilden muß in sich selbst, und vor allem soll sie ihm lehren, auch jede andre selbständige Gestalt der Poesie in ihrer klassischen Kraft und Fülle zu fassen, daß die Blüte und der Kern fremder Nahrung und Same werde für seine eigne Phantasie.

—Friedrich Schlegel, Gespräch über die Poesie

GEORG KAISER'S SWAN SONG: "GRIECHISCHE DRAMEN"

IAN C. LORAM
Cornell University

The last three plays which Georg Kaiser wrote as a trilogy¹ are a strange combination of pessimism and optimism. They have in common a mythical background — the legends of Pygmalion, Amphitryon, and Bellerophon, and testify at some length to their author's pessimistic belief that mankind is incapable of managing its affairs. The element of optimism also lies in this conclusion, because it seems clear from the ending of *Bellerophon* that some kind of mystical union with a greater power behind the world is Kaiser's final solution to the problem, which he felt so deeply, of the weakness and brutality of man's relationship to man.

There is much that is personal in the plays, particularly *Pygmalion*, and Kaiser never tired of speaking out against tyranny, violence, and war in all their various forms, as he does in *Zweimal Amphitryon*. But the emphasis, so vehemently expressed in many of the earlier plays, on the necessity and the ability of the individual to fight his way through, even though he be destroyed in the process, is missing here. In none of these dramas is the protagonist literally destroyed, and yet Kaiser makes it perfectly obvious that without the help of a higher power man is frustrated and defeated. He is no longer capable, as he once was for the expressionist Kaiser, of taking upon himself the sins of the world. What he needs now is the assistance of grace.

Pygmalion seems to be Kaiser's version of the now familiar theme of the "problem of the artist," and quite possibly of the author himself. Kaiser's persecution complex, his conviction that the artist cannot and should not be judged by ordinary standards, and the belief, not necessarily applicable only to himself, that the artist is a man unappreciated by his philistine fellows, all come into focus in the first part of the trilogy. Despite the fact that the persons of the drama have names and specific physical attributes, Kaiser is still working here, as he was in his early days, with types. Konon, the fig dealer of Athens, for whom Pygmalion has created his statue, is the representative of materialism and philistinism; Korinna, the widow of Corinth, who has supported Pygmalion in return for a half promise of marriage, is the picture of hypocrisy and all that is unpleasant in sex; Alexias, the elegant aristocrat from Thebes, appears as "high society," concerned only with the preservation of its reputation and "good name." All three appear as Pygmalion's enemies and accusers, and all have one trait in common — self-interest.

Pygmalion is presented to us as a dreamer — indeed, our first sight of him is as a sleepwalker — who hopes to find and embrace his ideal

¹Georg Kaiser, *Griechische Dramen* (Artemis-Verlag, Zürich, 1948). *Zweimal Amphitryon* was written 1943, *Pygmalion* and *Bellerophon* 1944. All three were first performed at Zürich in 1948. (The page numbers for all quotations refer to this volume.)

in the "äußerster Rand der Einsamkeit." This idyllic spot is an island, reached only after a journey beset with hardships. The water is bloodred, "als bluteten dort Wesen," and a fearful monster which envies the traveler his goal attempts to bar his way. Like Faust, Pygmalion sees that his aspirations are but fantasy and attempts suicide. He has given everything to the creation of his statue. It is the representation of beauty personified, the culmination of all that the artist strives for:

Unübertroffnes Bild der eignen Sucht,
die sich in solche Übermacht verleibt
des Widerspiels. Ich bleibe leer zurück
und habe aller Pulse bebend Leben vergabt
dem Werk. Selbstsüchtig und selbstlos —
mit keiner Grenze dieses Übertritts von
Sein und Nichtsein. So wird dies vollbracht,
dem wir berufen sind mit Fluch und Segen. (p. 11)

The suicide is prevented only by the intervention of Athene, who states in fairly unequivocal terms the thesis of the play. She is concerned for the future of art, which is inherent in man and yet is forever strange to him.

So seid ihr Künstler Fremdlinge im Volk,
das lieber steinigt als den Genius sieht.
Willst du noch mehr gefährden, was bedroht
ist schon nah dem Untergang? Darfst du dich
töten? (p. 14)

In other words, the artist has a responsibility to the world, and the implication is that he is not entitled to decide for himself whether to exercise that responsibility or not. As far as Kaiser is concerned, art is salvation, and we hear that Zeus would long ago have put an end to things had Athene not promised him that from time to time a work of art would appear which would make up for all

die Fäulnis an
der rohen Tat — der ruchlosen Beraubung
des Nächsten — sei's an Blut — an Gut — an
jedem, was jen' und dieser pflegt als Urbesitz. (p. 17)

The artist belongs to a "heiliges Geschlecht," and as such is, in Kaiser's opinion, the only person who can lead us to a better life.

Pygmalion's request to have his marble ideal imbued with life is granted, but only because he is so convinced of his mission. He does not feel that it is asking too much, and like Prometheus and Faust, compares himself to the divinity.

Begehre ich zuviel? Schuf Zeus mich
nicht? Bin ich nicht schaffend einem
Gotte gleich? Ist das Vermessenheit —
so schick' den Blitz! (p. 19)

The warning that "das Ungetüm in seiner schlamm'gen Höhle" will be a dangerous threat to his happiness is brushed aside. As yet the artist does not realize what the brutal, insensitive monster of public opinion can do.

But it is already too late. The artist is destined to suffer, and suffer as Christ did, "in der Erlösart für alle Menschen." This is an old expressionist idea, and one that Kaiser himself used more than once. The cashier in *Von Morgens bis Mitternachts* dies with his arms outstretched against the cross in the Salvation Army meeting hall, an obvious symbol for Kaiser's belief that the individual (in this case, to be sure, not an artist) is taking upon himself the sins of the world. But whereas in the heyday of expressionism Kaiser was convinced that this could be done by the individual alone, in 1944 this is only possible with the aid of grace, and even then the redemption of mankind is by no means assured. The artist will inevitably pay the price for his presumptuousness, justified though it may be in the eyes of the divine. He may momentarily experience the ultimate, but this experience is self-destruction.

Pygmalion comes up against the first sign of the ignorance and misunderstanding of the world when Konon, the merchant for whom he has created his statue, appears to claim it. Unwilling to admit that his work of art has come to life, Pygmalion attempts to lie his way out of his predicament, and succeeds only in compounding his difficulties. That the artist is a dreamer Kaiser has already told us, but here he seems to be saying that he is also naive and ill-equipped to compete with the selfish materialism of the world. With each of his three visitors, Konon, Korinna, and Alexias, Pygmalion finds himself in a more frustrating and agonizing situation. As an artist, he is unable to forego the pleasure of consorting with a creation which is part of him, and yet, as a human being, he cannot avoid the dilemma in which he finds himself. Nor can he actually comprehend it, despite the fact that he has been warned by the goddess what to expect. Even fate turns against him. When he tells Konon and Korinna that the girl whom they glimpse in his studio is the niece of a fine Theban gentlemen, the man whose name he has chosen at random appears to call him to account.

Kaiser's bitterness at the unthinking world becomes even more apparent in the relationship of the three accusers of Pygmalion to one another. Alexias, the aristocrat, despises Konon, the boorish self-made man, and Korinna, the grasping, oversexed widow. The latter feel quite as unkindly towards him, but upon discovering that they all have a common cause in the prosecution of Pygmalion, they are only too glad to join forces, and we see them in what is perhaps the most unpleasant scene of the play raving and shrieking for justice.

By the time Pygmalion is brought to trial in the market place of Athens he has begun to realize that if he tells the truth about his statue he will be ridiculed as a fool and a dreamer, and so he is forced to continue to perjure himself. Only when Chaire, the name he has given to the living statue, is threatened with torture does he blurt out the real story. In his love and fear for her he repeats what the statue meant to him and tells the truth:

Alles schloß sie ein,
was mir der Süchte heißeste gegolten
nach Leben überm dämmernd dumpfen Leben. (p. 114)

Pygmalion's tale is laughed out of court. He is set free under the condition that he marry Korinna. The court recognizes in a condescending manner that "du bist ein Künstler und unstet des Künstlers Bahn" and institutes a search for the missing statue.

Pygmalion's second suicide attempt is also foiled by Athene, who extricates him from his humiliating situation by changing Chaire back into stone just before the searchers arrive at the studio. She tells him:

Töte nicht die Kunst mit dir –
sie bilden Menschen, wenn sie göttlich
werden, und machen Götter machtlos, die
nur Menschen bilden. (p. 124)

The artist recovers sufficiently to promise to carry on with his task of creation when the goddess informs him that Chaire will never be delivered into the hands of the mob which calls her a prostitute, and he follows Korinna to their life together.

It is Chaire, shortly before she is restored to her original form, who sums up Kaiser's feeling, when she says:

Sei ohne Furcht
um mich – ich bin geborgen. Du wirst
vom Ungetüm verfolgt, solang' ich weile. (p. 132)

The realization of art is something that only the artist himself can experience and understand – and then only with divine help. The world will never understand it. It will ridicule the creator and plunge him into misery. Pygmalion, like Kaiser, comes to see this:

Es sollen Traum und Leben sich nicht einen
zum einz'gen Ring ohn' Anfang und ohn' Ende.

Find' ich schon Antwort auf die bange Frage,
die sich erst unermeßlich grenzend stellte
und nun zum drängend engen Kreise schrumpft,
aus dem die Flucht verwehrt? Flucht vor den Wunden,
die niemals heilen? Und die Blutspur zeigt
dich den Verfolgern an, die deine Werke wittern
als gute Beute nach gelungenem Handel? (p. 132)

This is, then, the fate of the artist in Kaiser's eyes. There is no lasting reward on earth for him. He cannot find the middle way of Tonio Kröger, but he does not go the way of Sappho either. He has a hint of something better in eternity, but in return for this hint and for a brief moment of ecstasy on earth he must, if he can, put up stoically with all the scorn and misunderstanding of his fellow man. We never really know what happens to Pygmalion. Kaiser leaves unanswered the question of whether he can continue to be creative. In spite of his promise to Athene to carry on in return for the last glimpse of Chaire before she is returned to stone, one has the feeling that because he has poured his life into this

one inspired work, he will, as he says at the beginning of the play, remain forever "leer." Cäsar von Arx, in his postscript to the *Griechische Dramen*, says: "Der Dank der Götter — Erlösung — ist ihm gewiß." It is true that Zeus has postponed the destruction of mankind once because of Pygmalion's talent, and it is likewise true that Athene tells him that divine suffering will be his lot and his greatest treasure for the remainder of his life, but from the tone of Pygmalion's final monologue and the dull "ich komme" as he follows Korinna at the end, one has the unpleasant feeling that the artist is not strong enough to resist the pressures put upon him. The one positive conclusion to which Pygmalion does come is that the artist's dream and his life can never be fused.

Zweimal Amphitryon has none of the wit or humor of Molière, Kleist, or Giraudoux. It is from beginning to end deadly serious, despite the seemingly absurd ending. Here again, in the person of the military leader, Kaiser attempts to prove his point that the individual has no future except through the intervention of divine power. Amphitryon, loved — one could almost say idolized — by the beautiful Alkmene, has been so wrapped up in his desire for fame and power that he has never even consummated their marriage, having left Alkmene on their wedding day on a campaign to raze Pharsala. His self-effacing wife is comforted by Zeus, who sees her as "erschütternd menschlich, daß ein Gott sich sehnt nach einem Menschen." Schütz compares the situation to that of Iphigenie and her effect upon Thoas,² but there can be no question of comparing the "reine Menschlichkeit" of Iphigenie with the character of Alkmene. The humanity of Alkmene lies simply in the fact that she is a woman who loves. She is in no way an Iphigenie or Charlotte von Stein. It is not Alkmene who transforms her husband, it is Zeus. True, Amphitryon is forgiven because of the impression she has made upon the god:

Dankt es Alkmene, daß mein Zorn beschwichtigt —
und mehr: ich trank aus diesem Quell,
der Menschenliebe heißt — und bin ein Seliger,
zum andernmal besiegelt durch Alkmene! (p. 260)

but there is none of the power of personality in Alkmene that one feels in Iphigenie. Kaiser may have intended us to feel it, but it is not there. The mere fact that Alkmene appears so infrequently in the play is an indication that Kaiser was not primarily interested in her effect upon her husband. His concern in all of these plays is not so much with "Menschlichkeit" as it is with "Gnade." It is Amphitryon who is saved by divine intervention, just as is Pygmalion. Alkmene and Chaire may be looked upon as catalysts in this refining process, but in the final analysis Kaiser's emphasis lies in the fact that humanity alone is not enough.

Amphitryon himself is another of Kaiser's "types," the personification of the glorification of war, power, violence. He is completely selfish.

² Adolf Schütz, *Georg Kaisers Nachlaß*. (Frobenius AG. Basel, 1951), p. 55.

He acts like a spoiled child when his officers oppose a new campaign after the fall of Pharsala; he has a tantrum, but as soon as this has had the desired effect he is "sogleich freudig," and all the signs of anger and tears disappear immediately. Zeus chastises him in strong language for this self-centered brutality:

Ihr habt den Tod geschändet durch den Mord,
den ihr mit schaler Heuchelei umlügt
in Krieg der Männer — männerwürdiges Tun.
Es ekelt einen Gott es zu vernehmen —
blutrünstiges Geschwätz von Schlacht und Sieg,
da Menschen über Menschen triumphieren,
die den zerfetzten Leib am Boden schleifen! (p. 259)

And then comes Alkmene's reward — the prophecy of the birth of Hercules. Hercules, who will first cleanse the world of all the trash that has accumulated in it, and then:

Danach ruft er zum Kampf — ruft nach Olympia.
Es soll die Lust am Kräftespiel nicht weichen.
Doch Kraft kämpft wider Kraft. Nicht List mit List.

So sind die Spiele von Olympia
des Weges neues Ziel! (p. 260)

It comes as something of a shock to hear that the Olympic games are the remedy for all the evil and unhappiness on earth. But Schütz offers an explanation for this, and while it seems fairly plausible from the evidence he supplies, it is still unsatisfactory. He has collected a rather impressive array of jottings from Kaiser's notebooks to support the contention that: "Wie für Kaiser das Drama ein 'Sprung direkt ins Komplette' ist, so soll für die Allgemeinheit, die 'durchschnittlich Starken,' der Sport der Durchgang zum Geiste werden." Such stray notes of Kaiser's as: "Krieg ist Abschied vom Leben — Sportkampf ist Steigerung des Lebens," and "Krieg ist verschmutzter Sport," or, "Den Leib denkfähig machen, (Viel spazieren. Fußballspielen.)", would seem to indicate that Kaiser really was concerned with the theory of "Mens sana in corpore sano." And yet this idea does not appear in other plays. If we are to take Kaiser at his word, we are, regardless of the fact that he was a sports enthusiast, still somewhat taken aback at the thought that athletics is the necessary prerequisite to "Geist."

Although *Zweimal Amphitryon* was the first play of the trilogy under consideration, it appears in printed form as the second. In a way this makes for a more logical sequence. *Pygmalion* ends on a vague and puzzling note — we do not quite know how his life will shape itself. *Amphitryon* has a more definite destiny: he is to remain in exile until the birth of Hercules, and then presumably will return to educate him and reap the benefits of the young man's feats. We will see in *Bellerophon* that Kaiser carries the tentative beginnings of a solution to man's problem to a definite conclusion.

Bellerophon is perhaps the least satisfying unit of the trilogy. At the same time it can be considered the most pessimistic. Here Kaiser gives up completely the attempt to have man save himself by his own efforts or by any virtue that may be inherent in him. Direct and final intervention by the divine is the last hope. Pygmalion remains on earth to do — what? Amphitryon has hopes of seeing a better world, but only through the efforts of a demigod. Bellerophon and Myrtis, his beloved, are removed directly to the beyond with the help of the winged horse. The last stage directions of the play read: "Hoch entschwindet das Flügelpferd mit Myrtis und Bellerophon. In blauer Sternennacht entbrennt ein neuer Stern." We must accept this as Kaiser's final word. What he attempts to show here is that a good man cannot compete with this world. The Delphic oracle has decreed that the Chimaera can be killed only by a man "rein von Unrecht." This man is Bellerophon, unjustly accused by King Proitos of looking upon the queen while she is bathing. Even when Proitos knows that Bellerophon is pure because he manages to kill the monster, he tries to hurt him, spurred on by his licentious and vicious wife Anteia. Here the divinity intervenes, disgusted with man's corruption. If the Chimaera represents evil in the abstract, then Proitos and his wife are symbols of human evil, which never dies. Kaiser's condemnation of this and of the eternal materialism of the world is expressed by the god who rescues Bellerophon:

— Ich wählt' — Apollon — dich vertraulich aus
in dem Gewimmel, das der Herde gleich
am Boden spürt und grasend sein Gedränge
begierig nach dem fettern Halme schiebt.

Ich lieh' dir zauberisch das Weidenspiel,
das jedes Ohr verwundern müßte, wie
von kargen Ruten tönt es — ehrfurchtig
begegnet man ihm, der das Wunder röhrt.
Doch stumpf und dumpf verhärtet Taubheit sich
und wüste Überlegung sinnt den Tod. (p. 375)

Kaiser has chosen to write this trilogy in verse. One can exercise the same criticism of his verse as of the overall effect of many of his plays — it is cold, and for the most part, hard. There are occasional flashes of sensuous beauty, but Kaiser vacillates too frequently between a simple, straightforward style and one which is so concentrated as to be distorted. The exclamation point and the dash — so beloved by the expressionists, are still part of his technique. The constant parallelism, at which Kaiser admittedly is a past master, becomes wearying in plays as long as these. Inversions are heaped one upon the other, and one begins to wonder whether Kaiser's style comes naturally to him or whether there is always a searching for effect, a conscious effort on his part to make the reader puzzle over what is being said. What he is probably trying to do is to formulate his ideas in as concise and sharp a manner

as possible, but this often has an adverse effect, so that his succinctness leads him into ugly distortions.

We have said that this trilogy is pessimistic and optimistic. It can not be claimed that an interest in religion and mysticism is something entirely new for Kaiser. Such interests are part and parcel of much of expressionism and even of Kaiser's later, less obviously expressionistic work. But the conclusion to which he comes in these three plays goes far beyond anything he has said before. It still revolves around the theme of "the new man," but now the "Erneuerung" can come only through grace. There is no longer the emphasis on the "flight from reality into illusion." Rather, one must see here the flight into the only true reality — away from the illusion of the world. Those who feel that this is the solution for mankind will praise the optimism of "Griechische Dramen." Those who are convinced that man must work out the problem for himself, here and now, will regret that Kaiser has given up his faith in the potential of the human race.

Georg Kaiser undoubtedly saw himself in at least two of the principal protagonists of this trilogy. The plays seem to represent his last outcry against the world which he had fought all his life. Pygmalion is Kaiser the artist, Bellerophon Kaiser the idealist, whose last and only hope is that he will arrive at some sort of Nirvana and be

"entrückt in unerreichte Weite
des Lichts, das unverlöschlich sternenhell." (p. 376)

It is perhaps not without significance that there is in one of his letters a sketch of his tombstone, on it the one word: "Bellerophon."



A SOLUTION OF WALther VON DER VOgELWEIDE 26,33 — 27,6

GEORGE F. JONES
Princeton University

No editor has yet given a satisfactory solution to the sarcastic little poem in which Walther invidiously compares the generosity of Otto and Frederick, the current claimants to the crown of the Holy Roman Empire. The generally accepted text of this enigmatic little gibe is as follows:

Ich wolt hērn Otten milte nāch der lenge mezzen: 26,33
dō hāt ich mich an der māze ein teil vergezzen:
waer er sō milt als lanc, er hete tugende vil besezzen.
vil schiere maz ich abe den līp nāch sīner ēre:
dō wart er vil gar ze kurz als ein verschrōten werc, 27,1
miltes muotes minre vil dan ein getwerc;
und ist doch von den jāren daz er niht enwahset mère.
dō ich dem kūnege brāhte dez mez, wie er ūf schōz!
sīn junger līp wart beide michel unde grōz.
nū seht waz er noch wahse: erst ieze übr in wol risen gnōz.¹

Carl von Kraus, the leading Walther-scholar, states that the poem is not easy to understand. First he cites an interpretation given by W. Wilmanns,² which is as follows:

(Walther) habe Ottos Freigebigkeit nach seiner Leibeslänge bemessen wollen, da sei das Maß viel zu groß gewesen; er habe dann umgekehrt den Leib nach der Freigebigkeit gemessen, da wäre er gar zu kurz geworden.

Then, dissatisfied with this interpretation, he objects:

Aber da stimmt etwas nicht, wenn man ēre (36) kurzweg der *milte* (33) gleichsetzt. Denn dann kommt folgender schiefe Gegensatz heraus: "ich maß die Freigebigkeit nach der Körperlänge, da war erstere zu kurz (und letztere zu lang); ich maß die Körperlänge nach der Freigebigkeit, da war erstere zu kurz (und letztere zu — lang??)." Es ist also klar, daß ēre etwas anderes als *milte* bedeuten muß, u.z. etwas, das größer ist als die Körperlänge. Wählt man die Bedeutung "äußerliche ehrenvolle Stellung"¹), dann rückt alles ins Gleichgewicht und gewinnt obendrein tieferen Sinn, denn nun bezieht sich der Schluß des Ganzen: *nū seht waz er noch wahse: erst ieze übr in wol risen gnōz* in seiner zweiten Hälfte auf die *milte* Friedrichs (zum Unterschied von Otto, der *miltes muotes minre vil dan ein getwerc* ist), während das *wahsen* auf das Zunehmen an ēre zielt, d.h. auf den Aufstieg des Königs Friedrich zur Kaiserwürde.³

¹ Carl v. Kraus, *Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide*, 10. Aufl. (Berlin u. Leipzig, 1936), S. 34-35.

² W. Wilmanns, *Walther von der Vogelweide*, 4. Aufl. (Halle, 1916), I, 141.

³ Carl von Kraus, *Walther von der Vogelweide, Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1935), 83. Some time after completing this study I happened upon Hermann Schneider's review of this edition in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum* (55, 1936, 124 ff.). He too is dissatisfied with von Kraus' explanation of the passage but offers no solution.

Although von Kraus is right in refusing to equate *ére* with *milte*, he is wrong in thinking that the former is something larger than Otto's body; for actually it is something much smaller. This poem is written according to the conventions of the court poets, who never tired of assuring their patrons that a ruler's reputation (*ére*) was in direct proportion to his generosity (*milte*), especially to court poets. According to them, it was incumbent upon a ruler to exchange wealth for praise (*guot umb ére geben*). Walther himself had complained that the emperor Philip did not know how to win praise and *ére* through generosity (*wie man mit gâbe erwirbet pris und ére*; 19,22). Apparently Otto, involved as he was with the Church and his unruly vassals, had been unwilling or unable to give the minstrels as much as they expected. In any case, Walther stated that in generosity (*miltes muotes*) he was as small as a dwarf; and in a previous poem (26, 23-32) he had accused him of lacking *milte*. Consequently Otto's *ére* was very small.

The difficulty in interpreting this poem seems to result from a misunderstanding of the word *mezzzen*, which von Kraus (and possibly Wilmanns?) seems to have taken in the following sense:

DWb. Messen verb 4) . . . nach maß eine länge, einen umfang oder inhalt bestimmen.

This meaning would be about the same as:

NED Measure v. 2. To ascertain or determine the spatial magnitude or quantity of (something); properly, by the application of some object of known size or capacity.

This would obviously not fit in Walther's poem; for, if Otto's size were ascertained by applying his *ére* as a known yardstick, he would seem large rather than small. A two-meter man would naturally seem large if measured with a two-centimeter gauge. If *mezzzen* is understood in this way, we must agree with von Kraus that the poem is contradictory.

On the other hand, all difficulty disappears if we understand *mezzzen* in the following sense:

DWb. Messen verb 5) dieses messen (nr. 4) nun auch in manigfach freierem sinne, von einem geistigen überschlagen, ermessen, erkennen und bestimmen nach stärke und ausdehnung. . . .

(der kaiser) . . . lernt der länder heil nicht nach den siegen messen (Hagedorn)
der . . . die menschen nach dem werke, nicht nach dem glauben mißt (Blumauer)

This *geistiges Überschlagen* is about equivalent to:

NED Measure v. 6. To judge or estimate the greatness or value of (a person, a quality, etc.) by a certain standard or rule.

c 1374 Chaucer Boeth. III pr. ii. 51 (Camb. MS), Many folk mesuren and gessen that soueryn good by Ioye and gladnesse (L. *Plurimi vero boni fructum gaudio laetitiaque metuntur*).

The example from Boethius shows that the Latin verb *metiri* could be used in the sense of judge or estimate; and it is probable that the

MHG verb *mezzen*, like the ME verb *mesuren*, had acquired the same extended meaning, even if only as a semantic loan from Latin. In other words, *mezzen* included the meanings of both *abmessen* and *ermessen*.⁴ If it is taken in the latter sense, Walther's poem is quite logical. Rendered freely it means:

I wanted to estimate Otto's generosity by deducing it from his stature. However, I erred in this method of calculation; for, if he had been as generous as he was tall, he would have been full of virtue (which he was not). Then I tried to estimate his size by deducing it from his reputation (which is now low because he does not practice *milte*); and then (when judged by his reputation) he became far too small and undersized like a mis-cut piece of cloth (which he is not), since in generosity he is far smaller than a dwarf. Nevertheless he is so old that he will not grow any more (he had the opportunity to be generous while he was undisputed Emperor, but he failed to do so). When I brought this yardstick (the method of deducing size from reputation) to King Frederick, how he shot up! (because he enjoyed a good reputation as a result of practicing *milte*). His young body became great and large. Now see how much more he will grow (as Emperor he will be able to increase in *milte*). He already stands above Otto like a giant.

Whereas *êre* and *milte* are not identical, the former depends upon the latter; or, to use mathematical terminology, *êre* is a function of *milte*. Therefore Walther could have used either word in v. 36 without changing the basic thought: Otto would have seemed small if judged by either his reputation or his generosity, since these, being reciprocally dependent, were both small. It is likely that Walther chose the word *êre* because it rimed conveniently with *mère*, there being very few MHG words that rhyme with *milte*. There is no need to suppose that *êre* in v. 36 refers to the position of Emperor; for Otto was already falling from power at the time Walther wrote this poem. Although Otto officially ruled until 1215, Frederick was elected Emperor in 1212. That Walther recognized the new claimant is shown by the fact that in this poem, as in a previous one, he calls Frederick "King" (27,3; 26,25) but calls Otto only "Sir" (26,33; 26,23 and 30).

In his introduction to this poem, Wilmanns (II, 134) says "the image that the poet uses recalls the popular tale of the cloak by which the virtue of the ladies at Arthur's court is tested: it becomes too short for the tall one and too long for the short one; and it fits only the right one."

⁴ This meaning of *mezzen* fits Hennig Brinkmann's interpretation of this poem (*PBB*, LXIII, 1939, 352). However, Brinkmann does not indicate that he means his interpretation to differ from that of von Kraus, although his deviations are indicated elsewhere in his study. This meaning also fits Hans Böhm's prose translation (*Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide*, Berlin, 1944, 154), which is also unannotated. It almost appears that these two scholars have intuited Walther's meaning but do not wish to attack von Kraus' explanation.

I do not believe that this is what Walther had in mind. His humor is of a very different nature, being based upon a playful process of false reasoning. His poem is more reminiscent of a little ditty popular in my childhood, which ran: "It's hard to tell the depth of a well by the length of the handle on the pump. Oh, it's hard to gauge a camel's age by the length of the hair on its hump." Walther has achieved the same incongruity by trying to gauge one characteristic by deducing it from a different and completely unrelated characteristic.



PERSONALIA FOR 1956-57

* Indicates the chairman of the department. A new member in the department is indicated by giving the name of the institution with which he was last associated in parentheses under his name.

Adelphi College (Garden City, N. Y.)

Prof.: Siegfried H. Muller,* Ph. D.
(On leave II)
Asst. Prof.: Anton M. Huffert, Ph. D.
Instr.: Eva M. Merrett, Ph. D.

Univ. of Akron (Akron 4, Ohio)

Prof.: Robert T. Ittner,* Ph. D.
Instr.: Herbert W. Smith, Jr., Ph. D.
(Univ. of Wisconsin)
Emeritus: Charles Bulger, Ph. D.

Univ. of Alabama (University)

Prof.: J. C. Hayes,* Ph. D.
F. A. Raven, Ph. D.
(On leave in Marburg)
Instr.: Charles A. Dell
(Univ. of Colorado)
Mary Gray Porter
Vernon W. Shepard
(Univ. of Tennessee)

American Univ. (Washington 16, D. C.)

Prof.: Alva L. Davis,* Ph. D.
John G. Frank, Ph. D.

Amherst College (Amherst, Mass.)

Prof.: Anthony Scenna,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: Murray B. Peppard, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: Henry L. Tapp, Ph. D.
Emeritus: Otto Manthey-Zorn, Ph. D.
Assistants: 3

Univ. of Arizona (Tucson)

Prof.: Frederick J. Schmitz,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: J. R. Beck, Ph. D.
Instr.: Harvey I. Dunkle, Ph. D.
Babbette Luz
Thomas Smitham
Assistants: 1

Univ. of Arkansas (Fayetteville)

Prof.: J. W. Thomas,* Ph. D.
Instr.: Wilhelmina Iggers, Ph. D.
Emeritus: Alfred Lussky, Ph. D.
Assistants: 1

Boston Univ. (Boston 15, Mass.)

Prof.: Waldo C. Peebles,* Ph. D.
Arthur J. Watzinger, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: Erich G. Budde, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: Paul Kurt Ackermann, Ph. D.
Instr.: Althea Wolfkopf
(Utica Branch, Syracuse Univ.)
Emeritus: Joseph N. Haskell

Bowdoin College (Brunswick, Maine)

Prof.: Fritz Koelln,* Ph. D.
Thomas A. Riley, Ph. D.
Instr.: Peter H. Batchelder
(Harvard Univ.)
Thomas R. Forsythe
(Columbia Univ.)

Brooklyn College (Brooklyn 10, N. Y.)

Prof.: Ernst Koch, Ph. D.
Dorothy Lasher-Schlitt, Ph. D.
Percy Matenko, Ph. D.
William R. Gaede, Ph. D.
(On leave 1956-57)
Asst. Prof.: Daniel Coogan, Ph. D.
(Deputy Chairman)
Walter Erhorn, Ph. D.
Anna Zollinger, Ph. D.
Hildegarde W. Fife, Ph. D.
Flora Klug, Ph. D.
Instr.: Gisela Stein, Ph. D.

Brown Univ. (Providence 12, R. I.)

Prof.: W. F. Twaddell, Ph. D.
Alan Holske, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: K. R. Bergethon, Ph. D.
K. S. Weimar, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: Robert Minshall, Ph. D.
Instr.: Fred R. Love
(Yale Univ.)
Emeritus: A. Herrmann
Assistants: 3

Bryn Mawr College (Bryn Mawr, Pa.)

Prof.: Fritz Mezger,* Ph. D.
(Graduate Division)
Myra R. Jessen,* Ph. D.
(Undergrad. Division)
Assoc. Prof.: Joachim Seyppel
Asst. Prof.: Martha M. Diez
Instr.: Herta Stephenson
Emeritus: Max Diez, Ph. D.

Bucknell Univ. (Lewisburg, Pa.)

Prof.: Adolf I. Frantz,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: Albert M. K. Blume, Ph. D.
Assistants: 1

Univ. of Buffalo (Buffalo 14, N. Y.)

Prof.: J. Alan Pfeffer,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: George C. Schoolfield, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: Byron J. Kockcock, Ph. D.
Instr.: Ralph Brundrett, Ph. D.
Henry M. Hollenstein
Hanna Lange
Assistants: 2

Univ. of California (Berkeley 4)

Prof.: Robert T. Clark, Jr.* Ph. D.
C. Grant Loomis, Ph. D.
Philip M. Palmer, Ph. D.
Archer Taylor, Ph. D.
Hans Wolff, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.: Madison S. Beeler, Ph. D.
Marianne Bonwit, Ph. D.
Andrew O. Jaszi, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.: Joseph Mileck, Ph. D.
Eugene E. Reed, Ph. D.
Blake L. Spahr, Ph. D.
Bjarne Ulvestad, Ph. D.
(Indiana Univ.)

Instr.:	Karl S. Guthke, Ph. D. Carlton L. Iiams, Ph. D.	Instr.:	Friedrich Ohly, Ph. D. (Visit. from Univ. of Frankfurt)
Associate:	Edith J. Lewy		A. Margaret Arent
Emeritus:	Clair Hayden Bell, Ph. D. Edward V. Brewer		Emmon Bach Thor Gabrielsen
	Arthur Brodeur, Ph. D. Lawrence M. Price, Ph. D. Erwin G. Gudde, Ph. D. Franz Schneider, Ph. D. Alice P. Tabor, Ph. D.		Chester Nathan Gould, Ph. D. Wolfgang Liepe, Ph. D.
Assistants:	18	Assistants:	2
Univ. of California (Los Angeles 24)			
Prof.:	G. O. Arlt, Ph. D. A. K. Dolch, Ph. D. W. D. Hand, Ph. D. V. A. Oswald,* Ph. D. E. Wahlgren, Ph. D.	Prof.:	G. F. Merkel, Ph. D. (On leave, 1956-57)
Assoc. Prof.:	C. W. Hagge, Ph. D. V. W. Robinson, Ph. D. Eli Sobel, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	E. H. Zeydel,* Ph. D. Anne F. Baecker, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	R. R. Heitner, Ph. D. W. F. Roertgen, Ph. D. T. H. Wilbur, Ph. D.	Instr.:	Rudolf A. Syring, Ph. D. Alexander Malycky
Instr.:	C. W. Hoffmann, Ph. D. (Univ. of Illinois)	Emeritus:	Eberhard Reichmann
Associate:	Stephanie Lombardi, Ph. D. Edith A. Schulz	Assistants:	Edward Eberhard
Assistant:	Leta J. Lewis W. Blumenthal		2
Emeritus:	F. H. Reinsch, Ph. D. W. J. Mulloy, Ph. D.	Clark Univ. (Worcester, Mass.)	
Assistants:	14	Prof.:	Karl J. R. Arndt,* Ph. D.
Carleton College (Northfield, Minn.)			
Prof.:	Ida W. Blayney, Ph. D. William Hammer,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.:	J. Stanhope Edwards
Instr.:	Weaver M. Marr, Ph. D. Arnold D. Mendel	Colby College (Waterville, Maine)	
Emeritus:	T. Lindsey Blayney, Ph. D. Peter Oleson	Prof.:	John Franklin McCoy*
Carnegie Inst. of Tech. (Pittsburgh 13, Pa.)			
Prof.:	Fred Genschmer,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.:	Philip Stewart Bither
Assoc. Prof.:	Sara Elizabeth Piel, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	Henry Otto Schmidt
Asst. Prof.:	Eugen L. Caliendo Emanuel Salgaller, Ph. D.	Colgate Univ. (Hamilton, N. Y.)	
Emeritus:	William F. Kamman, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Clifford E. Gates,* Ph. D.
Catholic Univ. (Washington 17, D. C.)			Karl F. Koenig, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Leo A. Behrendt,* Ph. D.		Glenn E. Waas, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Henry C. Sorg, Ph. D. Siegfried A. Schulz, Ph. D. (Univ. of Maryland)	Assoc. Prof.:	George J. Mundt, Ph. D.
Assistants:	1	Asst. Prof.:	Walter Gieseke (Whittier College)
Univ. of Chicago (Chicago 37, Ill.)			
Prof.:	Gösta Franzen, Ph. D. Helena M. Gamer, Ph. D.	Univ. of Colorado (Boulder)	
	O. J. M. Jolles, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Gerhard Loose, Ph. D.
	George J. Metcalf,* Ph. D.		Paul G. Schroeder, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	H. Stefan Schultz, Ph. D. Viola Manderfeld	Assoc. Prof.:	Isaac Bacon, Ph. D.
	Wolfgang Fleischhauer, Ph. D. (Visit. Spring, '57. Ohio State)	Emeritus:	George A. C. Scherer,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Roger A. Nicholls, Ph. D. Max Putzel	Assistants:	Friedrich W. Kaufmann (Oberlin College)
	Hans Eggers, Ph. D. (Visiting Summer, 1956, from Univ. of Hamburg)		7
Columbia Univ. (New York 27, N. Y.)			
Prof.:	Carl F. Bayerschmidt,* Ph. D.	Columbia Univ. (New York 27, N. Y.)	
	Benjamin Hunningher, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Carl F. Bayerschmidt,* Ph. D.
	Walter Silz, Ph. D.		Benjamin Hunningher, Ph. D.
	Andre von Gronicka, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.:	Walter Silz, Ph. D.
	William T. H. Jackson, Ph. D.		Jack M. Stein, Ph. D.
	Helen Mustard, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	Per-Axel Hildeman
	George J. Metcalf,* Ph. D.		Walter H. Sokel, Ph. D.
			Louise Gode Stabau
		Instr.:	Thomas Colby
			Inge D. Halpert
			Edmund P. Hecht
			Ernst Leo
			Gustave Mathieu
			Willy Schumann
			Gertrud Sakrawa
			Hugo Schmidt
		Emeritus:	Adriaan J. Barnouw, Ph. D.
			Gottlieb A. Betz, Ph. D.
			Frederick W. J. Heuser, Ph. D.
			Henry H. L. Schulze, Ph. D.
			Robert Herndon Fife, Ph. D.

Assistants:	Hugh W. Puckett, Ph. D.	Instr.:	Dirk Baay
12		Emeritus:	C. W. Perkins
Univ. of Connecticut (Storrs)		Hamilton College (Clinton, N. Y.)	
Assoc. Prof.:	Hans A. Maier, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Otto K. Liedke,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Wolfgang Paulsen, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.:	Robert M. Browning, Ph. D.
	Fritz Semmler, Ph. D.	Harvard Univ. (Cambridge 38, Mass.)	
Instr.:	Hans W. Weber	Prof.:	Stuart Atkins,* Ph. D.
			Bernhard Blume, Ph. D. (Ohio State Univ.)
Cornell Univ. (Ithaca, N. Y.)			Henry C. Hatfield, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Victor Lange,* Ph. D.	Lecturer:	Reginald H. Phelps, Ph. D.
	M. J. Cowan, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	Gerald F. Schmidt, Ph. D.
	W. J. Moulton, Ph. D.		Egon Schwarz, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	A. G. de Capua, Ph. D. (Univ. of Illinois)	Instr.:	Lee B. Jennings, Ph. D. (Univ. of Colorado)
	Ian Loram, Ph. D.		Gustav A. Komitzky, Ph. D.
Instr.:	R. Nothmann		Herbert L. Kufner, Ph. D. (Cornell Univ.)
Emeritus:	A. L. Andrews, Ph. D.		Robert B. Lichtenstein, Ph. D.
	A. W. Boesche, Ph. D.	Emeritus:	William G. Howard, Ph. D.
Assistants:	12		Heinrich Schneider, Ph. D.
			Taylor Starck, Ph. D.
Dartmouth College (Hanover, N. H.)		Assistants:	8
Prof.:	Frank G. Ryder,* Ph. D.	Haverford College (Haverford, Pa.)	
	Merle C. Cowden	Prof.:	Harry W. Pfund,* Ph. D.
	James L. Scott	Asst. Prof.:	John R. Cary, Ph. D.
	Stefan J. Schlossmacher, Ph. D.	Emeritus:	John Alexander Kelly, Ph. D.
	Herbert R. Sensenig, Ph. D.	Hofstra College (Hempstead, N. Y.)	
Emeritus:	Raymond W. Jones, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Joseph G. Astmann,* Ph. D.
De Pauw Univ. (Greencastle, Indiana)		Assoc. Prof.:	Frederick J. Churchill, Ph. D. (Dep. Repres, for German)
Prof.:	G. H. Grueninger,* Ph. D.	Instr.:	Valentine C. Hubbs
Asst. Prof.:	Margaret Baerg	Assistants:	1
Instr.:	Carl Steinhauer	Univ. of Houston (Houston 4, Texas)	
	Anton Luderer, Ph. D. (On Fulbright from Vienna)	Assoc. Prof.:	Alfred R. Neumann,* Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Gerhard Baerg, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	Hans Pitsch
Duke Univ. (Durham, N. C.)		Instr.:	Jane W. Malin
Prof.:	Herman Salinger,* Ph. D.	Assistants:	1
	Lambert A. Shears, Ph. D.	Howard Univ. (Washington 1, D. C.)	
Assoc. Prof.:	W. Cary Maxwell, Ph. D.	Prof.:	Stanton L. Wormley,* Ph. D.
	Frederick E. Wilson	Asst. Prof.:	Wolfgang S. Seiferth, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Wolfgang F. Taraba, Ph. D. (Princeton Univ.)	Instr.:	Karl D. Darmstadter
Instr.:	Peter Ilkow, Ph. D. (Harvard Univ.)	Assistants:	Maria P. Alter
Emeritus:	Clement Vollmer, Ph. D.		Leroy H. Woodson, Ph. D. (On leave I)
Assistants:	Charles A. Krummel, Ph. D.	Hunter College (New York 21, N. Y.)	
1		Prof.:	Carl Selmer, Ph. D.
Univ. of Florida (Gainesville)		Assoc. Prof.:	Guenther Keil, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	O. F. Jones, Ph. D.		Edgar Hemminghaus, Ph. D. (Dean of students.)
	M. E. Valk, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.:	Hunter College, Bronx)
	M. O. Mauderli, Ph. D.		Lena F. Dahme,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	J. E. Craps, Ph. D.	Instr.:	S. Etta Schreiber, Ph. D.
Franklin & Marshall College (Lancaster, Pa.)			Jean T. Wilde, Ph. D.
Prof.:	J. William Frey,* Ph. D.		Bertha M. Masche
Assoc. Prof.:	Paul P. Martin		Frederic P. Gutekunst
Asst. Prof.:	Peter S. Seadle		Edith Cappel, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Irene P. Seadle		(In office of Dean of Students, Hunter College, Bronx)
George Washington Univ. (Washington D. C.)		Emeritus:	Ines Braver
Assoc. Prof.:	Gretchen L. Rogers, Ph. D.		Yvette Louria, Ph. D.
	Wolfram K. Legner,* Ph. D.		Anna Jacobson, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	James C. King, Ph. D.		Lillie V. Hathaway, Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Edward H. Sehrf, Ph. D.		
Assistants:	1		
Grinnell College (Grinnell, Iowa)			
Prof.:	O. H. Hauptmann, Ph. D.		
Assoc. Prof.:	F. Andrew Brown, Ph. D.		

Univ. of Illinois (Urbana)

Prof.:	John R. Frey, Ph. D.
	Ernst A. Philippson, Ph. D.
	Detlev W. Schumann, Ph. D.
	Henri Stegemeier, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Mimi I. Jehle, Ph. D. (On leave II)
	Francis J. Nock, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Frank G. Banta,* Ph. D.
Instr.:	Roger Norton, Ph. D.
	Pauline Steiner Schwalbe, Ph. D.
	Richard Thurber, Ph. D.
Emeritus:	J. T. Geissendoerfer, Ph. D.
	Charles A. Williams, Ph. D.

Indiana Univ. (Bloomington)

Prof.:	Norbert Fuerst, Ph. D.
	Hans Jaeger, Ph. D.
	H. J. Meessen,* Ph. D.
	Harry V. Velten, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Frances H. Ellis, Ph. D. (On leave 1956-57)
	Henry H. Remak, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Frederick J. Beharrell, Ph. D.
	Donald S. Berrett
	Grace N. Martin
Instr.:	Foster W. Blaisdell, Ph. D. (Univ. of Calif., Berkeley)
	William M. Gartman (Univ. of Illinois)
Emeritus:	E. O. Wooley, Ph. D.
Assistants:	10

Iowa State Univ. (Iowa City)

Prof.:	Erich Funke,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Herbert O. Lyte, Ph. D.
	Fred L. Fehling, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Edgar List, Ph. D.
	Milton Zagel, Ph. D.
Assistants:	8

Johns Hopkins Univ. (Baltimore 18, Md.)

Prof.:	Harold Jantz, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	William H. McClain,* Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Ernst Feise, Ph. D.
	William Kurrelmeyer, Ph. D.
Assistants:	9

Univ. of Kansas (Lawrence)

Prof.:	J. A. Burzle,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	A. Schioettz-Christensen, Ph. D. (On Fulbright)
	George W. Kreye, Ph. D.
	P. M. Mitchell (On leave)
Asst. Prof.:	Sidney M. Johnson, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Samuel E. Anderson
	Eugene Norwood (Bryn Mawr)
	Elsbeth Pulver, Ph. D.
	Helga K. Vigliano
Emeritus:	A. M. Sturtevant, Ph. D.
	E. F. Engel
Assistants:	4

Kent State Univ. (Kent, Ohio)

Prof.:	Adolf E. Schroeder,* Ph. D. (Univ. of Mass.)
Assoc. Prof.:	Walter L. DeVolld
	Esther L. Grant, Ph. D.

Asst. Prof.:	Georgiana Babb, Ph. D.
Emeritus:	William G. Meinke, Ph. D.
Assistants:	1

Univ. of Kentucky (Lexington)

Prof.:	Adolph E. Bigge,* Ph. D.
	Daniel V. Hegeman, Ph. D.
	Paul K. Whitaker, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Norman H. Binger, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	John H. Ubben, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Calvin H. Evans (Univ. of Oregon)
	John A. Rea
Assistants:	1

Lawrence College (Appleton, Wis.)

Prof.:	John F. McMahon*
Asst. Prof.:	Dorrit Friedlander
Instr.:	Warren H. Caryl
Emeritus:	Gottlob C. Cast, Ph. D.

Lehigh Univ. (Bethlehem, Pa.)

Assoc. Prof.:	John Schrader Tremper,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Marion Candler Lazenby, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Ulrich Weissstein, Ph. D.
	William V. Glebe (Univ. of Washington)

Emeritus:	Robert Pattison More
-----------	----------------------

Louisiana State Univ. (Baton Rouge)

Prof.:	John T. Krumpelman, Ph. D.
	Carl Hammer, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Earl Nicholas Lewis

Assistants:	1
-------------	---

Marquette Univ. (Milwaukee 3, Wis.)

Prof.:	William Dehorn,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Christopher Spalatin, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Robert E. Simmons, Ph. D. (Stanford Univ.)

Assistants:	5
-------------	---

Marshall College (Huntington, W. Va.)

Assoc. Prof.:	Julius Lieberman,* Ph. D.
	Walter H. Perl, Ph. D.

Univ. of Maryland (College Park)

Prof.:	Adolf E. Zucker,* Ph. D.
	Augustus J. Prahl, Ph. D. (On leave)
	Dieter Cunz, Ph. D. (On leave I)
Assoc. Prof.:	Charles F. Kramer
Asst. Prof.:	Eitel W. Dobert, Ph. D. (On leave)
	Mark Schweizer, Ph. D.
	Ludwig Hammerschlag, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Thaddeus Lockard (Univ. of Virginia)
	Charles N. Lee

Assistants:	2
-------------	---

Mass. Inst. of Tech. (Cambridge 39, Mass.)

Prof.:	William N. Locke,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Morris Halle, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Joseph R. Applegate, Ph. D.
	Noam A. Chomsky, Ph. D.
	Martin Dyck, Ph. D. (Univ. of Cincinnati)
	Richard F. Koch
	Victor H. Yngve, Ph. D.

Lecturer:	Pierre H. Piguet (Switzerland)	Robert H. Drummond (Oberlin)
	Herman Klugman, Ph. D.	Else M. Fleissner, Ph. D. (Wells)
Univ. of Massachusetts (Amherst)		Herb. Lederer, Ph. D. (Wabash)
Prof.:	Frederick C. Ellert,* Ph. D.	Harold Lenz, Ph. D. (Queens)
Assoc. Prof.:	Peter Heller, Ph. D. (Harvard Univ.)	Eva Merrett, Ph. D. (Adelphi)
Instr.:	Henry A. Lea Eva Schiffer Elizabeth Welt, Ph. D. (Yale Univ.)	Karl-Heinz Planitz, Ph. D. (Lake Forest Academy)
	Edmund Stawiecke	Joachim Scypel, Ph. D. (Bryn Mawr)
Univ. of Miami (Coral Gables, Fla.)		Univ. of Minnesota (Minneapolis 14)
Prof.:	Melanie R. Rosborough*	Prof.: Lynwood G. Downs, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Robert S. Whitehouse	Assoc. Prof.: Herman Ramras,* Ph. D.
	Albert Ivanoff	Edwin F. Menze, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Lee Butterfield	Frederick L. Pfeiffer, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Joanne Goeser Knoche	Frank H. Wood, Ph. D.
Miami Univ. (Oxford, Ohio)		Asst. Prof.: Alvin E. Prottengier
Prof.:	J. R. Breitenbacher,* Ph. D.	Instr.: Gerhard H. Weiss, Ph. D. (Univ. of Wisconsin)
	G. L. Matuschka, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Oskar C. Burkhard, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	P. W. Doepper	Gina O. Wangness
	E. W. Steiniger, Ph. D.	Assistants: 6
	C. W. Bangert	Univ. of Mississippi (University)
Emeritus:	C. H. Handschin, Ph. D.	Prof.: R. W. Tinsley*
Michigan State College (East Lansing)		Assoc. Prof.: William Eickhorst, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Hermann H. Thornton,* Ph. D.	Assistants: 1
	Stuart A. Callacher, Ph. D.	Univ. of Missouri (Columbia)
Assoc. Prof.:	George W. Radimersky, Ph. D.	Prof.: Hermann Barnstorff,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Orville L. Abbott, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Elsa Nagel
	Laszlo Borbas, Ph. D.	Instr.: Nicholas E. Alssen
	Johannes Sachse, Ph. D.	William R. van Buskirk
	Mark O. Kistler, Ph. D.	Mount Holyoke College (South Hadley, Mass.)
	George P. Steinmetz	Prof.: Erika Meyer,* Ph. D.
Instr.:	M. Doreen Leonhardt	Assoc. Prof.: Edith A. Runge, Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Leo Cecil Hughes	Asst. Prof.: Henry Tapp, Ph. D.
Univ. of Michigan (Ann Arbor)		Instr.: Sidonie Cassirer (Brown Univ. Ext. Div.)
Prof.:	Henry W. Nordmeyer,* Ph. D.	Emeritus: Ellen C. Hinsdale
	F. B. Wahr, Ph. D.	Grace M. Bacon
	W. A. Reichart, Ph. D.	Assistants: 4
	H. Penzl, Ph. D.	Univ. of Nebraska (Lincoln 8)
	O. G. Graf, Ph. D.	Prof.: William K. Pfeiler,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	C. K. Pott, Ph. D.	Werner A. Mueller
	Frank X. Braun, Ph. D.	(Visiting from Wyoming)
Asst. Prof.:	A. J. Gaiss, Ph. D.	Paul Schach
	H. Bergholz, Ph. D.	(On leave in Germany)
	Max Dufner, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Donald E. Allison, Ph. D.
	A. Van Duren, Ph. D.	John Winkelmann, Ph. D.
	(In Administration)	Instr.: Elizabeth R. Werkmeister
Instr.:	F. A. Lambassa, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Joseph E. A. Alexis, Ph. D.
	M. C. Crichton, Ph. D.	Assistants: 5
	W. N. Hughes, Ph. D.	New York City College (New York 31)
	E. K. Grotzegut	Prof.: Sol Liptzin,* Ph. D.
	(ULCA)	Samuel L. Sumberg
Emeritus:	N. L. Willey, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Ludwig Kahn, Ph. D.
Assistants:	15	Herbert Liedke, Ph. D.
Middlebury College (Middlebury, Vt.)		John B. Olli, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Werner Neuse,* Ph. D.	Richard Plant, Ph. D.
Lecturer:	Eloise Neuse	Friedrich Thiele, Ph. D.
Staff of German Summer School:		Max Weinreich, Ph. D.
	Gerhard Storz (Schwäbisch Hall, Württ.)	Eugene Gottlieb, Ph. D.
	Willy Bloch (Frankfurt a. M.)	Adolf Leschnitzer, Ph. D.
		Werner Mierman, Ph. D.
		Nathan Süsskind, Ph. D.
Instr.:		Erich Guttmann, Ph. D.
Emeritus:		Joseph von Bradish, Ph. D.

New York Univ. (Washington Sq., N. Y. 3)	Emeritus:	Hans Sperber, Ph. D. August Mahr, Ph. D.
Prof.: Ernst Rose,* Ph. D.	Assistants:	10
Charlotte Pekary, Ph. D.		
Asst. Prof.: Dorothea Berger, Ph. D.	Ohio Univ. (Athens)	
Arthur Geismar, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Paul G. Krauss,* Ph. D.	
Edgar Lohner, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Morton Benson, Ph. D.	
Instr.: Marlene Clewing	Lecturer: Walter Naumann, Ph. D.	
Lilo de' Negri, Ph. D. (Barnard College)		
Paulene H. Roth	Univ. of Oklahoma (Norman)	
Emeritus: G. C. L. Schuchard, Ph. D.	Prof.: W. A. Willibrand, Ph. D.	
Univ. of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)	Assoc. Prof.: Johannes Malthaner, Ph. D.	
Prof.: F. E. Coenen, Ph. D.	Gerhard Wiens, Ph. D.	
W. P. Friedrich, Ph. D.	Erich Eichholz, Ph. D.	
John G. Kunstmann,* Ph. D.	Instr.: George Harjan	
G. S. Lane, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Roy Temple House, Ph. D.	
Assoc. Prof.: H. W. Reichert, Ph. D.	Assistants: 1	
Asst. Prof.: R. T. Taylor (Yale Univ.)	Univ. of Oregon (Eugene)	
Assistants: 8	Prof.: Edmund P. Kramer, Ph. D.	
Northwestern Univ. (Evanston, Ill.)	Asst. Prof.: Astrid M. Williams, Ph. D.	
Prof.: C. R. Goedtsche,* Ph. D.	Wolfgang A. Leppmann, Ph. D.	
W. F. Leopold, Ph. D.	Instr.: Franz Langhammer, Ph. D.	
Heinrich Schneider, Ph. D. (Harvard Univ.)	(Luther College, Iowa)	
Assoc. Prof.: Meno Spann, Ph. D.	Penn. State Univ. (Univ. Park, Pa.)	
Asst. Prof.: R. J. Doney, Ph. D.	Prof.: Philip A. Shelley,* Ph. D.	
Heinrich Stammer, Ph. D.	Helen Adolf, Ph. D.	
Leland Phelps, Ph. D.	Albert F. Buffington, Ph. D.	
Instr.: Ronald Hauser	Herbert Steiner, Ph. D.	
Kenneth Negus	(On leave)	
Assistants: 5	Assoc. Prof.: Werner F. Striedieck, Ph. D.	
Univ. of Notre Dame (Notre Dame, Ind.)	Asst. Prof.: Dagobert de Levie, Ph. D.	
Prof.: George J. Wack	Emeritus: Nora E. Wittman	
William H. Bennett, Ph. D.	Instr.: Lorraine M. Gustafson (Columbia Univ.)	
Rev. J. D. Muckenthaler, C.S.C.	Emeritus: George J. Wurfl	
Asst. Prof.: Rev. Laurence Broestl, C.S.C.	Assistants: 5	
Edward P. Pinigis (On leave 1956-57)	Univ. of Penn. (Philadelphia 4)	
Assistants: 3	Prof.: Otto Springer,* Ph. D.	
Oberlin College (Oberlin, Ohio)	Ernst Jockers, Ph. D.	
Prof.: John W. Kurtz,* Ph. D.	Adolf D. Klarmann, Ph. D.	
Assoc. Prof.: Joseph R. Reichard, Ph. D.	Alfred Senn, Ph. D.	
Heinz Pulitzer, Ph. D.	Adolph C. Gorr, Ph. D.	
Instr.: John Gearey (Columbia)	Associate: Carl J. Engblom	
Christina Trendota, Ph. D. (Minnesota)	Instr.: Richard C. Clark, Ph. D.	
Betty Temoyan (Bryn Mawr)	Barbara Allen Woods, Ph. D.	
Lecturer: Marjorie Hoover, Ph. D.	Gerhard Baumgärtel, Ph. D.	
Emeritus: F. W. Kaufmann, Ph. D.	Antanas Klimas, Ph. D.	
Assistants: 2	Philipp F. Veit, Ph. D.	
Ohio State Univ. (Columbus 10)	Harry Haile	
Prof.: Wolfgang Fleischauer, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Axel J. Uppwall, Ph. D.	
Oskar Seidlin, Ph. D.	Assistants: 7	
Dieter Cunz, Ph. D.	Pomona College (Claremont, Calif.)	
(Visiting, fall 1956, from	Prof.: Carl L. Baumann,* Ph. D.	
Univ. of Maryland)	Assoc. Prof.: Emily Wagner, Ph. D.	
Asst. Prof.: Wayne Wonderley,* Ph. D.	Princeton Univ. (Princeton, N. J.)	
(Acting Chairman)	Prof.: Heinrich Meyer, Ph. D.	
Justina D. Epp	(Visiting from Muhlenberg	
Sigurd Burckhardt, Ph. D.	College, 1956-57 I)	
Glenn H. Goodman	Assoc. Prof.: Bernhard Ulmer,* Ph. D.	
Ilseodore M. Edse	Werner Hollmann, Ph. D.	
Paul Gottwald	Asst. Prof.: Richard Kuehnemund, Ph. D.	
	George F. Jones, Ph. D.	
	Edward A. McCormick, Ph. D.	
	(On leave 1956-57)	
	Peter C. Spycher, Ph. D.	

Instr.:	Konrad J. Schaum, Ph. D. Richard Seymour, Ph. D. Richard C. Exner (Univ. of Rochester) Richard J. Brown, Ph. D. (Yale Univ.)	Smith College (Northampton, Mass) Prof.: Paul G. Graham, Ph. D. Assoc. Prof.: Marie Schnieders,* Ph. D. Asst. Prof.: Anita Ascher, Ph. D. (On leave)
Emeritus:	Harvey Hewett-Thayer, Ph. D.	Instr.: Helene Sommerfeld
Assistants:	2	Marion Sonnenfeld
Purdue Univ. (Lafayette, Indiana)		Emeritus: Joseph Wier, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Elton Hocking,* Ph. D. Earle S. Randall, Ph. D.	Assistants: Ann E. Mensel
Assoc. Prof.:	S. Edgar Schmidt, Ph. D.	Instr.: 1
Asst. Prof.:	Hubert Jannach, Ph. D. J. Collins Orr	
	Lawrence R. Radner	
Instr.:	Clifford A. Barraclough Walther L. Hahn, Ph. D. (Univ. of Texas) W. Merle Hill	Univ. of S. Dakota (Vermillion)
	James M. Spillane	Prof.: Alexander P. Hartman,* Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Eric V. Greenfield Otto A. Greiner	Assoc. Prof.: Richard B. O'Connell, Ph. D.
	John T. Gunn	Asst. Prof.: John E. Oyler
Rice Institute (Houston, Texas)		Emeritus: J. C. Tjaden, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Joseph Alexis, Ph. D. (Visiting from Univ. of Nebr.)	Univ. of South. Calif. (Los Angeles 7)
Assoc. Prof.:	Andrew Louis,* Ph. D.	Prof.: Harold von Hofe, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Marvin Baron (On Fulbright from Germany)	Ludwig Marcuse, Ph. D.
	Edward Dvoretzky (Harvard Univ.)	Erwin T. Mohme, Ph. D.
	Edmund Kaminski (Penn. State Univ.)	Assoc. Prof.: Stanley R. Townsend, Ph. D. (On leave)
	Jos. B. Wilson	Emeritus: John T. Waterman,* Ph. D.
Emeritus:	Max Freund, Ph. D.	Assistants: Ruth Baker Day
Queens College (Flushing, N. Y.)		
Assoc. Prof.:	Lienhard Bergel, Ph. D. R. Travis Hardaway,* Ph. D.	Southern Methodist Univ. (Dallas 5, Texas)
	Harold Lenz, Ph. D.	Prof.: Gilbert J. Jordan,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Edmund P. Kurz, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: T. Herbert Etzler, Ph. D.
	Marianne Zerner, Ph. D.	Instr.: Megan Laird Comini
Instr.:	Evelyn Bersak, Ph. D.	Stanford Univ. (Stanford, Calif.)
Univ. of Rochester (Rochester 20, N. Y.)		Prof.: Friedrich W. Strothman,* Ph. D.
Prof.:	Arthur M. Hanhardt,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Kurt F. Reinhardt, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	William H. Clark, Jr., Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Henry Blauth
Asst. Prof.:	Josef M. Kellinger, Ph. D.	Helmut Boeninger, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Jessie H. Kneisel, Ph. D.	Daniel C. McCluney, Jr., Ph. D.
	Wilhelm Braun, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Gertrude L. Schuelke, Ph. D.
	John Kempers	Assistants: Bayard Q. Morgan, Ph. D.
Emeritus:	J. P. King, Ph. D.	4
Assistants:	2	
Rutgers Univ. (New Brunswick, N. J.)		Swarthmore College (Swarthmore, Pa.)
Prof.:	Albert W. Holzmann,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Hilde D. Cohn, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Claude Hill, Ph. D.	Franz H. Mautner, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Johannes Nabholz, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Justus Rosenberg, Ph. D. (Univ. of Dayton)
Instr.:	William F. Amann	Emeritus: Karl Reuning, Ph. D.
	John L. Guest	
	Lothar E. Zeidler	
Douglass College		Syracuse Univ. (Syracuse 10, N. Y.)
Prof.:	E. L. Jordan,* Ph. D.	Prof.: Frederic J. Kramer,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Alice Schlimbach, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Henry J. Groen, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Erna Kritsch, Ph. D.	Herbert H. J. Peisel, Ph. D.
		Albert Scholz, Ph. D.
		A. D. Weinberger, Ph. D.
		Asst. Prof.: Kathryn N. de Lima
		Emeritus: William Gorse
Temple Univ. (Philadelphia 22, Pa.)		
Prof.:	Ames Johnston, Ph. D.	
Assoc. Prof.:	Christian Schuster,* Ph. D.	
Asst. Prof.:	William W. Langebartel, Ph. D.	
Emeritus:	Charles Evans, L.H.D.	
Assistants:	3	
Univ. of Tennessee (Knoxville)		
Prof.:	Reinhold Nordsieck,* Ph. D.	

Assoc. Prof.:	H. W. Fuller, Ph. D.	Univ. of Vermont (Burlington)
Asst. Prof.:	Edda T. Hankamer, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: James F. White,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	R. K. Bernard, Ph. D. (Acting)	Asst. Prof.: Harry H. Kahn
Emeritus:	John L. Kind	Truman M. Webster
Assistants:	2	Albert W. Wurthmann
Univ. of Texas (Austin 12)		Emeritus: Fred Donald Carpenter
Prof.:	L. M. Hollander, Ph. D.	Univ. of Virginia (Charlottesville)
	E. P. Lehmann,* Ph. D.	Prof.: Frederic T. Wood,* Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Helmut Rehder, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Matthew Volm, Ph. D.
	W. F. Michael, Ph. D.	Ast. Prof.: Harry Tucker, Jr., Ph. D.
	C. V. Pollard, LL. D.	Walter L. Heilbronner, Ph. D.
	George Schulz-Behrend, Ph. D.	Instr.: Francis J. Brooke, III, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Stanley N. Werbow, Ph. D.	Wagner College (Staten Island)
Instr.:	C. H. Holzwarth, Ph. D.	Prof.: Kenneth Scott,* Ph. D.
	Don C. Travis, Jr.	Gaspard L. Pinette, Ph. D.
	A. Leslie Willson, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Frederick Hiebel, Ph. D.
	Leroy R. Shaw, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Frederick H. Willecke
Emeritus:	J. L. Boysen, Ph. D.	Emeritus: Faust Charles DeWalsh
Assistants:	11	Theodore Emil Palleske
Tulane Univ. (New Orleans 18, La.)		Assistants: 1
Assoc. Prof.:	U. Everett Fehlau,* Ph. D.	Univ. of Washington (Seattle 5)
	Erich A. Albrecht, Ph. D.	Prof.: Curtis C. D. Vail,* Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	Margaret L. Groben, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Herman C. Meyer, Ph. D.
	Myrtle T. Moseley	Carroll E. Reed, Ph. D.
Assistants:	2	William H. Rey, Ph. D.
Union College (Schenectady 8, N. Y.)		(On leave)
Prof.:	Frederick A. Klemm,* Ph. D.	Annemarie Sauerlander, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Hans Hainebach, Ph. D.	Robert L. Kahn, Ph. D.
Asst. Prof.:	William Oldenbrook, Ph. D.	Franz Rene Sommerfeld
Emeritus:	George H. Danton, Ph. D.	Richard F. Wilkie, Ph. D.
Assistants:	Morton C. Stewart, Ph. D.	George C. Buck, Ph. D.
	1	(On leave)
U. S. Military Academy (West Point, N. Y.)		Otto M. Sorensen
Prof.:	Col. W. J. Renfroe, Jr.	Rene Taube
Asst. Prof.:	Maj. George R. Moe*	Ernest O. Eckelman, Ph. D.
	Fritz Tiller, Ph. D.	Edward H. Lauer, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Maj. Harry B. Hardy	Felice Ankele, Ph. D.
	Capt. Richard L. Morton	Max Schertel, Ph. D.
	Lieut. Norman E. Dunlap	Elenora M. Wesner
U. S. Naval Academy (Annapolis, Md.)		Assistants: 6
Prof.:	Henry W. Drexel*	Washington Univ. (St. Louis 5, Mo.)
Asst. Prof.:	Kurt P. Roderbourg	Prof.: Fred O. Nolte, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Lt. Col. W. J. Thinnnes, USAF	Erich P. Hofacker,* Ph. D.
	Lt. (jg) R. Whitman, USNR	Assoc. Prof.: Raymond Immerwahr, Ph. D.
Univ. of Utah (Salt Lake City)		(Guggenheim grant)
Prof.:	Llewelyn R. McKay,* Ph. D.	Liselotte Dieckmann, Ph. D.
	Paul E. Wyler, Ph. D.	(On leave)
Asst. Prof.:	James B. Hepworth, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: James W. Marchand, Ph. D.
	Arval L. Streadbeck, Ph. D.	Assistants: 3
Instr.:	Phila V. Heimann	Wayne Univ. (Detroit 1, Mich.)
	Robert E. Helbling	Prof.: Harold Basilius, Ph. D.
Assistants:	3	Carl Colditz,* Ph. D.
Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, N. Y.)		J. K. L. Bihl, Ph. D.
Prof.:	Ruth J. Hofrichter,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: John F. Ebelke, Ph. D.
	Ada K. Bister, Ph. D.	Asst. Prof.: Vladimir Bezdek, Ph. D.
Assoc. Prof.:	Elizabeth Zorb, Ph. D.	Hermann Poster, Ph. D.
Instr.:	Mary B. Morrison	Bernhard Valentini, Ph. D.
	Dorrit Cohn	Erhard Dabringhaus
Emeritus:	Lilian L. Stroebel, Ph. D.	Assistants: 2
Wellesley College (Wellesley, Mass.)		Wellesley College (Wellesley, Mass.)
Assoc. Prof.:	Barbara Salditt,* Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Barbara Salditt,* Ph. D.
	Magdalene Schindelin, Ph. D.	

Instr.: Emeritus:	Martha J. Goth, Ph. D. Marianne Thalmann, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Emeritus: Assistants:	Sieghardt M. Riegel, Ph. D. Lester Seifert, Ph. D. Werner Vordriede, Ph. D. Lida Kirchberger, Ph. D. Friedrich Bruns, Ph. D. Robert O. Röseler, Ph. D. 5
Wells College (Aurora, N. Y.)			
Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus:	O. S. Fleissner,* Ph. D. E. M. Fleissner, Ph. D. Arthur R. Schultz, Ph. D. Edson M. Chick, Ph. D. Arthur S. Wensinger John C. Blankenagel, Ph. D. Paul H. Curts, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Emeritus: Assistants:	William I. Schreiber,* Ph. D. William H. Wilkening Rinehart E. Kyler 1
Wesleyan Univ. (Middletown, Conn.)			
Prof.: Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus:	Chadbourne Dunham,* Ph. D. Laurence Gemeinhardt, Ph. D. Arthur R. Schultz, Ph. D. Edson M. Chick, Ph. D. Arthur S. Wensinger John C. Blankenagel, Ph. D. Paul H. Curts, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Emeritus: Assistants:	Adolph J. Dickman,* Ph. D. Werner A. Mueller, Ph. D. (On leave) Frank Maystorovich
West Virginia Univ. (Morgantown)			
Prof.: Assoc. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus:	Victor J. Lemke,* Ph. D. Robert Stilwell, Ph. D. Donald T. Huffmann (Indiana Univ.) Harley U. Taylor, Jr.	Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus:	Heinz Bluhm,* Ph. D. C. von Faber du Faur, Ph. D. K. Reichardt, Ph. D. H. J. Weigand, Ph. D. G. Nordmeyer, Ph. D. Liselotte Dieckmann (Visiting from Wash. Univ., St. Louis) P. Demetz, Ph. D. U. Goldsmith, Ph. D. F. D. Hirschbach, Ph. D. C. E. Schweitzer, Ph. D. C. Wood, Ph. D. T. S. Ziolkowski A. B. Benson, Ph. D. H. A. Farr, Ph. D. C. F. Schreiber, Ph. D.
Western Reserve Univ. (Cleveland 6, Ohio)			
Prof.: Assoc. Prof.: Asst. Prof.: Lecturer: Emeritus:	Theodore W. Braasch,* Ph. D. Hugo Karl Polt, Ph. D. Erminnie H. Bartelmez, Ph. D. Gertrude G. Benson Louise Kiefer Kaethe F. Lepehne	Assoc. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus: Assistants:	9
Williams College (Williamstown, Mass.)			
Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus:	Winthrop H. Root,* Ph. D. John Henry Fitzell, Ph. D. Richard Cartwright	Assoc. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus: Assistants:	Ralph P. Rosenberg, Ph. D.
Univ. of Wisconsin (Madison 6)			
Prof.: Emeritus:	Walter Gausewitz, Ph. D. Roe-Merrill S. Heffner,* Ph. D. Heinrich E. K. Henel, Ph. D. Martin Joos, Ph. D. J. D. Workman, Ph. D.	Assoc. Prof.: Instr.: Emeritus: Assistants:	9
Yeshiva Univ. (New York 33, N. Y.)			
Prof.:	Ralph P. Rosenberg, Ph. D.		

PROMOTIONS

1. To Rank of Professor
 - Stuart Atkins (Harvard)
 - J. K. L. Bihl (Wayne Univ.)
 - Ida W. Blayney (Carleton College)
 - Gösta Franzén (Univ. of Chicago)
 - Otto G. Graf (Univ. of Michigan)
 - Henry C. Hatfield (Harvard)
 - Alan Holske (Brown Univ.)
 - O. J. M. Jolles (Univ. of Chicago)
 - Percy Matenko (Brooklyn College)
 - Adolf E. Schroeder (Kent State Univ.)
 - Samuel L. Sumberg (New York City College)
 - Arthur J. Watzinger (Boston Univ.)
11. To Rank of Associate Professor
 - Isaac Bacon (Univ. of Colorado)
 - Helmut R. Boeninger (Stanford Univ.)
 - Frederick J. Churchill (Hofstra College)
 - Dagobert de Levie (Penn. State Univ.)
 - Walter L. DeVold (Kent State Univ.)
 - Morris Halle (Mass. Inst. of Tech.)

	Harold Lenz (Queens College)
	Daniel C. McCluney, Jr. (Stanford Univ.)
	Alfred R. Neumann (Univ. of Houston)
	Richard Plant (New York City College)
	Heinz Politzer (Oberlin)
	S. Edgar Schmidt (Purdue)
	Eli Sobel (U. C. L. A.)
	Friedrich Thiele (New York City College)
III.	To Rank of Assistant Professor
	Donald E. Allison (Univ. of Nebraska)
	Anne F. Baecker (Univ. of Cincinnati)
	Morton Benson (Ohio Univ.)
	Sigurd Burckhardt (Ohio State)
	Max Dufner (Univ. of Michigan)
	Martin Dyck (Mass. Inst. of Tech.)
	James B. Hepworth (Univ. of Utah)
	Lida Kirchberger (Univ. of Wisconsin)
	John E. Oyler (Univ. of South Dakota)
	Max Putzel (Univ. of Chicago)
	Lawrence R. Radner (Purdue)
	Egon Schwarz (Harvard)
	Walter H. Sokel (Columbia)
	Henry L. Tapp (Amherst)
IV.	To Rank of Lecturer
	Eloise Neuse (Middlebury)
V.	To Rank of Instructor
	Megan L. Comini (Southern Methodist)
	P. Demetz (Yale)
	Lilo de' Negri (New York Univ.)
	Calvin H. Evans (Univ. of Kentucky)
	Martha J. Goth (Wellesley)
	Antanas Klimas (Univ. of Pennsylvania)
	Eugene Norwood (Univ. of Kansas)
	Elsbeth Pulver (Univ. of Kansas)
	Otto M. Sorensen (Univ. of Washington)
	T. S. Ziolkowski (Yale)

DOCTORAL DEGREES GRANTED 1955-56

- Univ. of Calif., Berkeley: Carlton L. Iiams, "Albertinus and Antonio de Gevara" (Taylor); Harvey I. Dunkle, "Wieland's Aesthetic Criticism of Literature" (Clark); Leland S. Babcock, "Concepts of the Good Life in Stifter's Early Works" (Loomis); Ingeborg K. Engelsing, "Amor fati in Carl Zuckmayers Dramen, 1925-1955" (Bonwit); Leo T. Richter, "Italian Influence on German Literature to 1600" (Taylor); Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr., "Adverbs and Prepositions in the Oldest Icelandic Manuscripts" (Beeler).
- Univ. of Calif., Los Angeles: Richard H. Lawson, "A Comparative Study of the Latin and Old High German Verb Forms in *Tatian*" (Dolch).
- Univ. of Chicago: Werner Low, "Constantin Brunner and Twentieth Century German Thought" (Bergstraesser).
- Univ. of Cincinnati: Anne F. Baecker, "Gertrud von le Fort" (Zeydel); Joseph Bourgeois, "Enrica von Handel-Mazzetti" (Merkel); Martin Dyck, "Novalis and Mathematics" (Zeydel).
- Columbia Univ.: Paul E. Mueller, "David Zeisberger's Official Fairfield Diary, 1791-1795" (Jackson and Bayerschmidt); John Rothman, "Schiller's Dramatic Technique: Sermon and Stagecraft" (Silz).
- Cornell Univ.: Gertrud Merkel, "Regina Ullmann" (Lange); Herbert L. Kufner, "The Dialect of the Freutsmoos Area (Bavaria)" (Moulton).

- George Washington Univ.: Henry P. Hopper, "A Study of the Function of the Verbal Prefix *Ge-* in the Lindisfarne Gospel of St. Matthew" (Sehrt).
- Harvard Univ.: Bruce Hayward, "A Study of Imagery in the Works of Novalis" (Atkins); William H. Oldenbrook, "Johann Melchior Goeze, A Monograph" (Schneider); Peter Ilkow, "The Compounds of Old Saxon Biblical Poetry. A Semantic and Cultural Glossary" (Starck); Henry D. G. Smith, "The Early New High German *Belial*: History, Relationship of Manuscripts, and Partial Edition" (Starck).
- Univ. of Illinois: Josef Ryberg, "Separable Prefixes in Cruziger's Adaptations of Luther's Sermons (1530-1539)" (Philipsson).
- Indiana Univ.: Weaver M. Marr, Jr., "Theory and Practice in the Dramas of Paul Ernst" (Meessen).
- Iowa State Univ.: R. C. Wyatt, "The Use of Color in the Drama of German Expressionism" (Funke).
- Univ. of Maryland: Ann W. Kurtz, "Wieland as Editor of the *Merkur*" (Prahl).
- Univ. of Michigan: Bernard J. Fridsma, Sr., "Social and Cultural Criticism in the Works of Ernst Wiechert" (Wahr).
- Univ. of Minnesota: Kristina Trendota, "Das Löwenleitmotiv in Ricarda Huchs *Lebenswerk*" (Wood).
- Univ. of North Carolina: Kenneth E. Keeton, "The Berliner Montagsklub with Special Attention to the Period 1748-1798" (Kunstmann); Walter W. Arndt, "Germanic Dialect Evolution in Lexico-Statistic Time Perspective" (Lane).
- Northwestern Univ.: Franz Langhammer, "Das Novalisbild in Frankreich" (Spann).
- Ohio State Univ., Sigurd Burckhardt, "Sprache als Gestalt in Goethes Blankversdramen" (Seidlín).
- Univ. of Pennsylvania: Richard K. Seymour, "Nominal Word Formation by Suffixes in the Swabian Dialect" (Springer); Adolph H. Wegener, "The Death Problem in the Works of Ernst Wiechert" (Klarman); Antanas Klimas, "Primitive Germanic *kuningaz* and its Spread" (Senn). Louis Ziemand, "The Casuistics of Crime in Schiller's Dramas" (Jockers); Alexander Kallos, "Social Problem in the Work of Anton Wildgans" (Klarman).
- Univ. of Southern Calif.: Ruth Kilchenmann, "Wandel in der Gestaltung der Natur in den Werken Hermann Hesses" (Townsend).
- Stanford Univ.: Frederick C. Ellert, "The Problem of the Jew in Werfel's Prose Works" (Reinhardt); Robert O. Weiss, "A Study of Arthur Schnitzler" (Reinhardt).
- Univ. of Texas: Walter L. Hahn, "Themen und Motive in Gottfried Kellers Prosawerken" (Rehder).
- Univ. of Utah: James B. Hepworth, "The Dionysian Element in the Works of Thomas Mann" (Wyler).
- Univ. of Washington: Herbert F. Wiese, "The Resolution of the Father-Son Conflict in the Works of Franz Werfel" (Rey).
- Washington Univ.: Don Allison, "Schillers Ideological Approach to Tragedy" (Nolte).
- Wellesley College: Martha J. Goth, "Kafka et les lettres françaises" (Switzerland).
- Univ. of Wisconsin: Herbert W. Smith, Jr., "The Forms of Praise in the German Poetry of Paul Fleming (1609-1640)" (Gausewitz); Gerhard Weiss, "Die Prosaarke Werner Bergengruens" (Henel).
- Yale Univ.: R. J. Brown, "A Stylistic and Formal History of the MHG *leich*, 1190-1290" (Wellek, Reinhardt); H. Butterworth, "Motif-Index and Analysis of the Early Irish Hero Tales" (Reinhardt, Pope); M. W. Sonnenfeld, "The Figure of Hagen in Germanic Heroic Poetry and in Modern German Literature" (Weigand, Reinhardt).

NEWS AND NOTES

Jean-Paul-Gesellschaft Honors Prof. Geissendoerfer

The Jean-Paul-Gesellschaft bestowed its silver Jean Paul medal on Professor J. T. Geissendoerfer, now of Whittier, California, during his visit to Germany last year. Professor Geissendoerfer has been a member of the German Department at the University of Illinois since 1922, becoming Professor Emeritus in 1953.

University of Illinois.

—Francis J. Nock

European Study Trip for German Teachers

The Boston University Travel Courses are offering this summer a seven to eight week specialized and yet extensive Tour of Europe featuring countries where German and its dialects are spoken. This tour will be conducted by Professor Arthur Watzinger of the Boston University German Department and features instruction in spoken German during the whole tour.

The Germanic Tour starts in Holland and includes Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Alsace-Lorraine, the Dolomites in Italy, Vienna, and Berlin. Various music festivals will be attended, and the tour will finish up in London and Edinburgh.

A two-week workshop in Lausanne offers language and background courses for travel. The whole Germanic Tour carries six semester hours of college credit. Travel to and from Europe can be either by ship or plane, with no extra charge for air travel.

Since this tour will be limited to 12 persons and almost all travel will be by small private bus, interested parties are urged to enroll as soon as possible. For details write Boston University Travel Courses, 332 Bay State Road, Boston, Mass.

Wayne University European Study Tour

Wayne State University's College of Education and Graduate School again approve credit arrangements in connection with the Tenth Annual *European Study Tour in Comparative Education*. Personally conducted by Dr. William Reitz, Professor of Education, the tour will leave Detroit on June 21, 1957, and return on August 24, 1957.

Visiting 10 countries in 9 weeks, this tour is designed to provide teachers, students, and professional people with an opportunity to survey selected highlights of the life and culture of Western Europe. Qualified persons may earn up to 8 hours of undergraduate or graduate credit to apply on degree programs, for teaching certification, for annual salary increments, or for personal enrichment. Further information may be obtained from Dr. William Reitz, 727 Student Center, Wayne State University, Detroit 2, Michigan.

Table of Contents

Volume XLIX	January, 1957	Number 1
Friedrich Schlegel's Essay "On Goethe's 'Meister'" / Raymond Immerwahr	1	
Georg Kaiser's Swan Song: "Griechische Dramen" / Ian C. Loram	23	
A Solution of Walther von der Vogelweide 26,33-27,6 / George F. Jones	31	
Personalia for 1956-57	35	
News and Notes	46	

THE COSMOPOLITAN SUMMER SCHOOL IN THE ROCKIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Language House Program

for students with TWO years college study or equivalent experience in

FRENCH GERMAN SPANISH

Distinguished guest lecturers will be added to the resident faculty,
offering a wide range of courses to language students at all levels.

First term: June 14 to July 19

Second term: July 22 to August 24

For information write . . .

HEIDI BLOMSTER

Dept. of Mod. Lang. — Division B

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

BOULDER, COLORADO

GERMAN GRAMMAR for SCIENCE STUDENTS

NELSON VAN DE LUYSTER AND PAUL H. CURTS



What teachers are saying about this text –

"It is the best text for teaching the reading of scientific German that has come to my attention."

"The best in its field in my opinion."

"It fills a long-felt need in the field of scientific German."

"An excellent grammar, not only for science students, but also for others."

D. C. Heath and Company

Sales Offices: Englewood, N. J., Chicago 16, San Francisco 5, Atlanta 3,
Dallas 1 **Home Office:** Boston 16

Peter Fabrizius

... Lacht Am Besten

Edited by CLAIR HAYDEN BELL

A new collection of sparkling stories from the witty pen of Peter Fabrizius who was first introduced to the American classroom five years ago in a volume of highly entertaining stories entitled, *WER ZULETZT LACHT*. . . . Teachers and students alike have so enjoyed these selections that they have asked for more. . . . *LACHT AM BESTEN*, comprising twenty-one delightfully amusing stories, answers this demand. The new collection can be used either following the older book or as an alternate. It begins with easy simplicity but progresses to a more mature style, suitable for second semester German reading. It also serves well the needs of conversation classes. Brief exercises covering each story, footnotes on every page, and a German-English vocabulary are also included. The humorous illustrations were drawn especially for this collection by Anton Marek. *Just Published.*

APPLETON-CENTURY-CROFTS, INC.

35 WEST 32nd STREET

NEW YORK 1, NEW YORK